COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XI. No. 24.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 13, 1807. [PRICE 10D.

"When rogues fall out, honest men get their due."——OLD PROVERB.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

THE WRANGLING FACTIONS.——The capture of Dantzic by the French having given a new feature to the war upon the Continent, and enabled us to reason, upon something like grounds, with respect to the result of that war, and particularly as far as may relate to this country, it is time now to take a view of our situation as connected with foreign nations, and to ask a question or two respecting the object of the expedition, now said to be preparing. But, as we shall, at last, find, that our sole hope of an escape from the fate of Prussia, Holland, Naples, &c. &c. must rest upon the measures to be adopted at home, I cannot refrain from making, before I proceed to other matter, one more record of the waste of the public money, as stated and exposed in the mutual accusations of the *wrangling factions*. Sir Francis Burdett complains of the RED BOOK; he uses the simile of the robbers; he calls for a destruction of the system of corruption. What is the consequence? The hirelings of *both* factions fly on upon him with the yell of wolves, and want not the will to use the fangs of that ravenous and vindictive animal. Now, then, let us hear their *own account* of the manner in which the Red Book is filled, and the motives by which the fillers are actuated. I have had my eye upon them for some time. I have heard their railings against the "Jacobins and Levellers;" and now I shall put their own exposures upon record. They are long and full in their statements; but, these statements should be read, and well remembered. They perish too soon in a loose open sheet. They ought to be bound up in a book, and frequently referred to. I beg every reader to peruse them with attention; and, when he has so done, to ask himself this question: "if this be true, is not Sir "Francis Burdett's address perfectly proper?"——We will begin with an extract from the Morning Chronicle newspaper of the 3d instant.——"A gross misrepresentation of the conduct of Mr. Fox and "Lord Howick, with respect to their under "secretaries, having appeared in several "newspapers, we are induced to lay before our readers the following Statement "of Facts, to the accuracy of which we "pledge ourselves: Mr. Fox has been "blamed for dismissing Mr. Hammond, together with Mr. Ward; and this removal "has been represented as inconsistent with "the censure which he himself bestowed "upon the dismissal of Mr. Aust, in 1799. "The cases were, however, entirely different. It had always been the practice "for a new secretary to appoint his under "secretaries; and if he continued those "in their places whom he found there, it "was to be considered equivalent to a re-"appointment; for nothing can be more "essential to the public service than that "the principal and the under secretaries "should be on confidential terms. But "Mr. Aust was removed without any change "of the principal Secretary of State, merely in order to make room for Mr. Canning, whom Mr. Pitt patronized and "wished to have near him. For no other "reason was Mr. Aust obliged to retire. "Of course a provision was made for him. "He was appointed Commissary General of "Musters and Secretary and Register of "Chelsea Hospital. These two offices, "thus united in his favour, had been held "by two different persons; of course a provision was required for them. Now, it "was to this traffic in places, and to a practice which must encrease the expense of "the service, by multiplying unnecessarily "the pensions to those who quitted the office, that Mr. Fox decidedly objected. "That the Secretary of State should be "forced to retain in the confidential place "of under secretary one who would not "posses his confidence, is a position never "maintained by Mr. Fox, or indeed by any "rational man. Mr. Hammond, who had "made himself a party man, in every "sense of the word, and whose whole connections were with the avowed enemies "of Mr. Fox, could no more have been "allowed to remain in the foreign office "than to hold a seat in the cabinet. To "remove him was a matter of absolute "necessity. Accordingly, he and Mr. Ward "were succeeded by Gen. Walpole and sir "F. Vincent. When Lord Howick came "to the foreign department, upon Mr.

" Fox's death, he continued these gentlemen " as under secretaries, because they possessed " his confidence; and when he left the of- " fice, they retired also, without any " pension or sinecure whatever.—If Mr. " Fox had followed the example of his " predecessor, he would have pensioned " Gen. Walpole or sir F. Vincent, on co- " ming into office. And if Lord Howick " had availed himself of the precedents left " him both by Lord Hawkesbury and Lord " Mulgrave, he would even in succeeding to " a friend, have removed at least one of the " under secretaries, and pensioned him, to " make way for a dependant or relation, whom " also he would have pensioned before he " retired from office. We assert, as a known " fact, that when Lord Harrowby retired " early in 1805, Mr. Elliot was removed " to make way for Lord M.'s brother-in-law, " Mr. R. Ward; and that one of the last " acts of Lord Mulgrave, before quitting " the foreign office early in 1806, was to " grant Mr. Ward a large pension for less " than a year's service, in a manner the " legality of which was so much doubted " that it was inquired into by the late mi- " nisters, with the determination of setting " it aside. This Mr. R. Ward knows " would have been done, had it not, un- " fortunately, been found that the grant, " however unprecedented, both as to the " grounds and manner of it, was neverthe- " less within the strict formalities of law. " Mr. Fox and Lord Howick can certainly " claim no praise for having avoided this " example of Lord M. But that Lord M's " friends and defenders should venture up- " on the discussion of any thing connected " with this subject, is a matter of wonder, " even to those who know the rashness of " the new men."—The next article is the answer of the *Courier* newspaper of the same day.—" There is a long article to- " day in the Morning Chronicle on the " subject of pensions to under secretaries of " state. We have not time to comment " now upon the general subject of sinecures " and pensions, though we pledge ourselves " to unmask the hypocritical pretensions " of the late men to superior purity, in any " respect whatever regarding the grants of " public money. As, however, it has " more than once been boldly stated, that " the pension to Mr. Ward was granted on " a fund never before applied to such uses, " and as it is insinuated that it was given " merely for a year's service, we will state " the real case. With respect to a provi- " sion generally to under secretaries on " retiring, it is a very gross misrepresenta- " tion to say that it has not long existed, " or that it ought not to exist. Mr. Aust " was rewarded by Lord Grenville himself " with sinecures to the amount of £2000 " a year; sir J. Burgess, under the same " Lord G., with a pension of £1200, " a year; Mr. Canning, by the same " Lord G., with £1200, a year; Mr. " Fisher, by the same Lord G., with " 600*l.* a year; Mr. Hammond, by the " same lord G., with 600*l.* a year, having " then 1200*l.* as a foreign minister, and " 600*l* a year besides, added to it last year " by Mr. Fox. Mr. Huskisson, by lord " Melville (then in the cabinet with lord " G.) with 1200*l.* a year; Sir G. Shee, in " the home department, with 1200*l.* a " year. So much for the novelty of an " under secretary's pension! Now as to " the fund, namely the office: the con- " stitution by which the right to recom- " mend to allowances for officers retiring " was settled, was the work also of lord " Grenville himself, in conjunction with " the other secretaries of state, so far back " as the year 1795, as appears by the order " of his Majesty in council. And how " often have allowances been granted? " Was Mr. Ward's the first instance? No " —it was the tenth in succession, in the " course of 11 years! and of the 9 preced- " ing instances, 5 were the work also of lord " G. If the writer in the Chronicle wishes " to know them, he will find them in the " office, under the heads of allowances to " Mr. Money, 380*l.* a year; Mr. Jenkins, " 400*l.* a year; Mr. Hinchcliffe, 600*l.*; Mr. " Hammond, 600*l.*; Mr. Fisher, 600*l.* " The object of the last grant was the pecu- " liar follower, protegé, and we believe " connexion, of lord G.; the grant was " made to him after a service of exactly 5 " months and about 14 days, and was " one " " of the last acts of lord G. on quitting " " the foreign office." It was held also " by him during his life, together with a " commission of excise, worth 1200*l.* a " year more! Do we blame lord Grenville " for this? No; nor do we believe that " the misrepresentations on which we are " commenting proceeded from his authority. " We know at least, in answer to another " part of that misrepresentation, that he " professed his opinion in favour of the " legality of the grant to Mr. Ward, to " which he also disclaimed all idea of hos- " tility. Four other instances of allowances " from the same fund in the office of secre- " tary of state, occur before Mr. Ward's, " viz. Mr. Colquhoun, 300*l.* a year; Mr. " Moore, 800*l.* a year; Mr. Higden, 500*l.*

" a year; Mr. Hay, 500*l.* Now as to the " motive of granting it! Was it a job to a " relation, or a compensation to a man in- " vited from a profession in which he was " advancing, and from the benefit of a study " of the Law of Nations, into an office in " which that law was daily and hourly an " object of discussion? We can state with " accuracy that the chancellor was ready to " put the seal to the vacant Welch judge- " ship in favour of Mr. Ward, when he " was desired to give his labours to another " department in the state. This is not only " a great professional honour, but a place " for life; and this, together with his " practice, Mr. Ward reliaquished, to at- " tend the call of Mr. Pitt and lord Mul- " grave, where it was thought his service " might be of particular use. We ask the " world, if a man foregoing such advantages " to obey such a call, is either to have no " compensation at all, or to have his " compensation after the precedents addu- " ced, stigmatized wholly unprecedented, " and proceeding from favour alone? As " to a former article in the Chronicle, that " Mr. Ward retired to a commission of bank- " rupts, besides his pension, it is neither " more nor less than a very foolish and wholly " unfounded assertion, and as such we shall " leave it. And so we also leave the " public to judge of the justice, the vir- " tuous accuracy, and purity of motive, " which characterise this creditable, party, " true, and most impartial statement."——

The MORNING CHRONICLE's reply, on the 6th instant, starts new and valuable matter.——" We have already exposed the " unfounded calumnies of Mr. Canning's " journalists, respecting the conduct of " his immediate predecessors in the " foreign office; and have demonstrated " by a plain statement of the facts, that " in arranging the appointments of this " department, Mr. Fox and lord Howick " were guided by a strict adherence to " those maxims of economy which no " one, save only the partizans of lord Mel- " ville, ever dared to treat with open con- " tempt. Attempts have been made, also, " to charge the same distinguished charac- " ters with removing English envoys in " order to make room for their own friends. " As this accusation is false beyond the or- " dinary measure of party misrepresenta- " tion, we shall here again narrate the " facts in question.——Soon after the " change of Administration in 1806, lord " G. L. Gower was allowed to return from " St. Petersburgh at his own desire. An " offer was explicitly made by Mr. Fox, " with a kind attention which lord G. L. G. " has not forgotten, that he might remain, " if he pleased, at a court where his con- " duct had given satisfaction. His lordship " consulted his own convenience and pre- " ferred coming home.——Mr. Pierrepont " solicited leave to return from Sweden, " chiefly on account of his health; Mr. " Stratton was appointed to succeed him; " a gentleman only known to lord Howick " by his long and able services in the diplo- " matic line; and further recommended " to lord H. by the misfortune of having " no powerful friends, which had kept " him in the shade during the Administra- " tions of the Hawkesburys and Mulgraves; " and which we lament to find has now " thrown him back again, when our foreign " affairs are administered by a man very " little indebted to family influence.—— " In the missions to Copenhagen, Lisbon, " Hamburgh, Dresden, and Berlin, no " change whatever was made either by " Mr. Fox or lord Howick. Mr. Jackson " and Mr. Wynne were of course obliged " to come home in consequence of the " war; when a military man was required " to replace the former of these gentlemen, " we presume that most people congratu- " lated the ministry on their prevailing " with such a person as lord Hutchinson " to fill that station; for the peculiar " merits of our present classical envoy " in a military capacity had not as yet dis- " played themselves. He was thought, not " so much to have in himself the science " of war, as to be—" the cause of war " in others."—In the embassy at Con- " stantinople no change whatever was " made until the Secretaryship became va- " cant, by Mr. Stratton's well-earned pro- " motion, and this appointment was con- " ferred on Mr. Pole, in consideration of " meritorious services performed by him in " a subordinate capacity, and of the warm " recommendations both from Mr. Arbuth- " not and the Court of Petersburg. This " gentleman was in every respect wholly " unknown to lord Howick; unless, indeed, " his being the eldest son of a very keen " antagonist (Mr. W. Pole, now of the " ordnance office) should be viewed as " ground for suspecting an undue prefe- " rence.——The necessity of recalling sir " A. Paget has never been questioned by " any one who read the secret correspon- " dence published by lord Mulgrave. The " late ministers have always been ready to " acknowledge that gentleman's professional " merits, and if the more serious irrepara- " ble evils produced by the publication in

" question, had left any room for personal " considerations, they would have regarded " the necessary loss of sir A. P.'s services " at Vienna, as an additional ground for " regretting that act of rashness and infa- " tuation. That the conduct of his suc- " cessor, Mr. Adair, has given the highest " satisfaction, both at home and at Vienna, " we venture to assert without the fear " of contradiction, even from Mr. Can- " ning; that Mr. Adair must be speedily " displaced, could never be doubted by " any one who reflected that our foreign " department is now in the hands of the " Anti-Jacobin poetasters, Messrs. Ham- " mond, Canning, Frere, &c. whose poli- " tical consistency would be impeached " were they to leave in employment a " gentleman formerly exposed to their " attacks in that celebrated performance— " and thus are the concerns of great em- " pires administered!——The recall of " Mr Elliot and Mr. Merry was rendered " necessary by circumstances which it is " needless to specify. These regard, not " so much the personal qualifications of the " two gentlemen in question, as the pecu- " liar state of affairs in the countries where " they were resident; while the conduct " of Mr. Erskine has given entire satisfac- " tion, and amply justified his nomination. " We confidently ask Mr. Canning himself, " now that he has seen a little of the office, " who could be more fit for the mission " to Palermo than Mr. Drummond? This " gentleman had no political connection, " but a slight personal acquaintance with " lord Howick. He was recommended to " the notice of the ministry, solely by his " known abilities in diplomacy, and his " former residence at the court of Naples, " to which he had been appointed by Lord " Hawkesbury; and here, indeed, lies the " whole offence of Mr. Drummond in " Mr. Canning's eyes.——As for Consul- " ships, they made not a single change in " that department. They granted the " usual floating pensions to sir A. Paget, " Messrs. Jackson, Spencer Smith, Pier- " repont, and Wynne. These gentlemen " were altogether the connections of former " ministers; and the pensions which they " now received, were such as the length " of their respective services entitled them " to, by the strictest precedents established " in the foreign department.——It is after " an administration of this kind—disgraced " by no jobs—marked by the most punctual " and decisive regard to the interests of " the service—and distinguished by the " most rigorous economy of the public " money, that lord Howick and his col- " leagues retire amidst the sincere regrets " of their countrymen; leaving, however, " an example behind them, which, if it " may fail to exite the emulation, must " at least prove some check to the miscon- " duct of their successors." ——Now, either this is true, or it is false. If false, the Morning Chronicle, who abuses Sir Francis Burdett, is a liar; if true, does Sir Francis deserve reproach for what he has said of the RED BOOK?—Leaving the Morning Chronicle to answer this ques- tion, let us proceed to the rejoinder of the COURIER of the same day.——— " The late ministers conclude an article " which they have published in a paper this " morning by boldly asserting that their ad- " ministration was "disgraced by no jobs." " A more daring assertion we never remem- " bered to have heard. The late ministry " began their career by a job, the enabling " lord Grenville to hold a large sinecure " with another office, the two being incom- " patible in the same person. Mr. Sheri- " dan said that Mr. Fox proposed to settle " on him the Duchy of Lancaster for life. " Enquiries were set on foot to know if the " Surveyorship of Woods and Forests could " not be settled on lord R. Spencer for life. " The Muster Master General of Ireland, " a lucrative sinecure, was divided between " Mr. T. Sheridan and a relation of lord " Howick's at the expence to the country of " a large pension to the then holder to in- " duce him to resign. An Irish sinecure of " 3000l. per annum was given to Cavendish " Bradshaw, without a pretence of claim. " A pension was granted to Judge Johnstone, " who has libelled lord Hardwicke; valua- " ble reversions were granted to Mr. Ers- " kine's clerk; and we believe a reversion, " or some such job, was given to Mr. " Wickham.—These foes to jobs and friends " to reform and economy, dismissed At- " kins, the Barrack-Master in the Isle of " Wight, who had exposed enormous " abuses, and who is now starving. A pen- " sion of 1200l. was granted to col. Con- " greve for throwing a few burning arrows " into Boulogne. Lord Howick's brother, " with four other Greys, have had lucrative " appointments; one was sent out com- " mander in chief to the Cape, with a salary " of 4000l. per annum, and another salary of " equal amount, as lieut. governor, though " under such circumstances a lieut. gover- " nor's salary has never been more than a " 100 pounds or two.—300 dependants " were provided for, at an expence of near- " ly as many thousands per annum, as au-

" ditors, secretaries, and clerks upon the " auditing establishment. When no ap- " pointment was open for an impatient de- " pendant, the language was, " put him " upon the Auditors till something better " can be done."—15 Judges were thought " by the late ministers insufficient for " the administration of justice in Scot- " land, though in England it is administer- " ed by a smaller number. New judicial " situations were therefore to be created, " and one of them was to have been supe- " rior in rank, dignity, and emolument to " any now in existence. To this new and " highest office, not the present president, " but a new officer, was to be appointed " (the brother of a cabinet minister.)—300 " new surveyors of taxes were on the eve " of being appointed at an enormous ex- " pence to the public. This measure was " to have received the sanction of parlia- " ment—and to make that sanction more " certain, and to demonstrate that this ad- " dition of patronage and expence was in- " tended by these foes to jobs, for the sole " purpose of better collecting the revenue, " on the eve of the general election last " autumn, the future sanction of parlia- " ment was anticipated by privately but ge- " nerally announcing to the favoured candi- " dates that such appointments would be " made, and that the recommendation of " their constituents would be attended to. " This fact, however, was unfortunately de- " layed till the dissolution of the late vigo- " rous administration, and nothing remain- " ed but the painful, yet necessary task of " apologising, which was actually done a " few days before they quitted office, for " those interests being so neglected, and " those promises so broken. Such are a " few of the proofs (not to mention any " thing at present of the increase of sheriffs " depute in Scotland, &c.) of the utter de- " testation in which the late ministers held " all jobs!!"——The COURIER, whose zeal for the public good is unwearied, was not content with what he had said on the 6th; and, therefore, on the 8th, after having availed himself of the rest of the Sabbath, he returned to his valuable exposures with renovated vigour, thus: " The late mi- " nisters alluding to the statements we made " on Saturday, respecting their jobs, contra- " dict some of them, and entirely pass over " others. Thus, for instance, they pass " over the job of enabling Lord Grenville " to hold a large sinecure with another of- " fice, the two being incompatible in the " same person, and contradict our state- " ment that Mr. Fox proposed to settle on " Mr. Sheridan the Duchy of Lancaster for " life. We have Mr. S.'s authority, how- " ever, that he did think of it, and intend " it for him. In the debate on the 25th of " March, on Mr. Martin's motion against " granting places for life, Mr. Sheridan " said, in answer to Mr. Johnstone, that " " with respect to the charge of his (Mr. " S) being busy in providing for himself " and his family, the fact was, that his hon. " friend, who was now unhappily no more " (Mr. Fox), thought that after a service, " he hoped not unmeritorious, of 27 years " in parliament, some provision for life " ought to be made for him. It had hap- " pened rather singularly, that his hon. " friend had intended, that the office that " had been so much spoken of this night, " the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lan- " caster, should be appropriated to that pro- " vision." Here we have Mr. S.'s positive " assertion, that Mr. Fox had intended the " Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster " for life, for him. With respect to one of " Lord Howick's brothers, the late minis- " ters have disclosed a fact of which we " were ignorant, that when Capt. Grey " was removed from Sheerness to Ports- " mouth, he had a place which fell vacant " in the West Indies given him, a valuable " sinecure, we take it for granted, it having " been held by Lord Ducie.——We find " too that Col. Grey having been disabled " by a severe wound in Holland, has been " placed on active service at the Cape.—— " As to the reversion to Lord Erskine's " clerk, it was admitted in the House of " Commons, that not one only, but two " had been granted.——The increase of the " number of Judges in Scotland, Surveyors " of Excise, Auditors, &c. an increase " which has entailed so immense an addi- " tional expence upon the country, is ad- " duced by the late ministers as one of their " regulations for enforcing economy!!—— " Upon the sinecure to C. Bradshaw, the " pension to Judge Johnstone, who libelled " Lord Hardwicke, the dismissal of Atkins, " who had exposed enormous abuses, they " preserve a profound silence. In our enu- " meration however, of jobs, we beg the " late ministers pardon, for forgetting to in- " clude their appointments, a day or two " before they were dismissed from office, " of persons to fill the situations of Collec- " tor of the Customs, Surveyor of the Cus- " toms, Waiters and Searchers at Buenos " Ayres, a place not then in our posses- " sion!"——Now, reader, sensible and impartial reader, this is the picture, which the factions themselves draw of the conduct

of each other. I will not ask you how, under a system like this, it is possible that our concerns with foreign nations should be properly managed; I will not ask you, whether you, as a farmer, or a merchant, or a gentleman, would entrust your affairs to such hands; but, I will ask you, whether, if what these writers say be true, they are not the most base of mankind to rail at the similies, and the assertions of Sir Francis Burdett? Here we have their own account of the conduct of the two factions. The two factions, through this channel, tell the world what they have done. It is in their own mouths that we find the accusations against themselves. Sir Francis Burdett says of them only what they say of each other; precisely that, and not a word more; and yet, they accuse him *of seditious language*, and call upon the parliament to *expel him!* They have been *feeling the public pulse* in this way for some weeks past; but, the public pulse beats to no such time. The public, even the very blindest of the public, now see; and, that they do see, thanks to these mutual exposures.

Sir Henry Mildmay.——It was easy to foresee, that the bitterness of party spirit, produced by the dissolution of parliament, would break out in *exposures*; not merely in the way of *paragraphs*, but in something more authentic; and this was, as the reader will, probably, recollect, one of the advantages which I hoped for from that very useful measure.——Mr. Perry, with the vindictive zeal of an ousted place-man, has got hold already of the Fourth Report of the Commissioners of Military Inquiry, and has, therefrom, taken, and published, in the Morning Chronicle of the 9th instant, the following curious and most interesting account of a bargain made by Pitt and his people with Sir Henry Mildmay, now one of the members for Hampshire.——We will, agreeably to our usual custom, first insert the article, and then make our remarks upon it. I say *we*, for, upon occasions like this, I cannot help perceiving, that I feel and think in common with all those who are taxed to provide the sums which are thus expended ——"Sir Henry Mildmay some "years ago succeeded, in right of his wife, "to a considerable estate in the neighbour-"hood of Chelmsford. Upon this property "there is a mansion-house (Moulsham-"hall), with gardens and pleasure grounds; "and Sir H. was obliged by the will of the "last owner, from whom he received it, to "reside there 3 months in every year; a "restriction always unpleasant when a pro-"prietor has other places of residence, and "rendered peculiarly so in this case from "circumstances which it is needless to par-"ticularize, both touching the situation of "Moulsham-hall and Sir H. M's family ar-"rangements. With this condition, never-"theless, he was forced to comply, however "inconvenient or disagreeable; and was, "of course, prevented from letting the "house and grounds, although during the "rest of the year he had no occasion for "them.——The land in the neighbourhood "of these grounds is let upon lease to dif-"ferent farmers, and in Aug. 1803, a part "of it was wanted by government for the "erection of military works. Sir H. M. "and his tenants immediately consented to "give up the space required for the public "service, amounting to about 30 acres, sti-"pulating, however, that a jury should, at "a convenient season, be summoned to "award them a compensation, according to "the provisions of the Defence Act. In "consequence of this permission on their "part, the works were erected without loss "of time.——The residence at Moulsham-"hall now became seriously disagreeable. "There were batteries a quarter of a mile "from the house, and two barracks at the "distance of half a mile, and an entrenched "camp occupied part of the Park. Sir H. "M. therefore, conceived that he had ob-"tained sufficient grounds for an act of par-"liament to relieve him from the obligation "of residing there. He applied to parlia-"ment accordingly, and in spring, 1804, "an act was passed to this effect, the whole "expences of which were paid by the "Treasury.——A few weeks after this "happy liberation (15th May, 1804), Sir "H. made an offer of his house to the "Quarter-Master-General, as a fit resi-"dence for the military staff of the district. "The rent which he demanded was £400 "a year, government to pay all taxes, and "leave the premises in good repair; for "he observed, they were then "in perfect "repair." Before this proposal could be "acceded to, a survey was directed to be "made by an architect, who reported that "£250 would be necessary immediately to "put the house and stables in repair, and "£50 a year to keep them up. This be-"ing communicated to Sir H. he offered to "give up the first half year's rent (£200) "on condition that the necessary repairs "should be made at the public expence. "To this proposal the War Office agreed, "and empowered Gen. De Lancey, Bar-"rack Master General, to conclude the bar-"gain. From some circumstances, not ex-"plained, it was delayed, and Gen. De Lan-

" cey was removed before he had entered " into the lease with Sir H. Mildmay.—— " In the mean time, and while the house " and pleasure-grounds remained in Sir H's " occupation, but after he had been relieved " by an act of parliament at the public ex- " pence, from the obligation of residing " there, a jury was summoned to fix the " compensation to him and his tenants for " the land occupied by the military works " They returned a verdict, 18th of Aug. " 1804, awarding the sum of 1300l. for the " first year, which was then nearly expired, " and 600 l. for every subsequent year, du- " ring which the land might be so occupied, " or at that rate.——As Government were " to restore the ground to its original state, " before giving it up to the proprietor, it " may naturally be asked, why so large a " rent as 600 l. a year should be given for " 30 acres of land, besides a round sum or " bonus of 700 l. at first? The Jury did not " specify how their estimate had been made, " nor in what way they meant their com- " pensation to be applied. But Sir H. M. " in his examination before the commission- " ers, states, that he understood the Jury to " have given 200l. per annum for the occu- " pation of the land, and 400 l. per ann. to " provide him with another place of resi- " dence." He accordingly has always paid " his tenants 200 l. a year, and taken to " himself the remaining part of the rent, " besides, as we conceive him to mean, " the extra 700l. But leaving that sum out " of the question, Sir H. M. has received, " and continues to receive, 400 l. a year, " because barracks and batteries were " erected in his neighbourhood; and an " act of parliament has been passed, at " the public expence, to relieve him from " the necessity of residing near those " barracks and batteries. We do not stop " to ask, if being relieved from this most " disagreeable restriction was no com- " pensation of itself, for the temporary in- " convenience of the military works—we " will not put it to Sir H. M., whether he " would not gladly have left Moulsham Hall " untenanted, while the works remained in " its neighbourhood, in order to relieve " himself from the condition of residing " there a quarter of every future year—with " this point we do not at present trouble " ourselves; but we repeat, that being at " once allowed to leave Moulsham Hall, " and paid, most liberally paid, for the al- " ledged nuisance brought into its vicinity, " he had no right to expect any thing more. " He had gained enough by the military " works in his neighbourhood.——This, " however, does not seem either to have " been his own opinion, or that of the Trea- " sury, or of H. R. H. the Commander-in- " Chief. The lease of the house and gar- " dens had not been concluded when Gen. " de Lancey left the barrack department; " and his successor, Gen. Hewett, before " executing it, found himself obliged by the " instructions under which he was acting, " to obtain special orders from the Trea- " sury. The delay in concluding the bar- " gain, had induced him to suspect that a " change of opinion might have taken place " respecting its probable benefits to the " public. Upon examining the circum- " stances of the case, he considered this the " more likely, for he found that, besides the " expence of immediate repairs, Moulsham " Hall would cost the public 643l. a year, and " would, after all, be an extremely incom- " modious residence for any officer. All " this he very properly submitted to the " consideration of the Commander-in-Chief " in a letter dated Nov. 27, 1804; and " about two months after he received an an- " swer, ordering him to put the premises in " a state of repair, and to report, as soon as " they should be ready for the reception of " officers. In this answer the following " reason is given for concluding the bargain " with Sir H. M. " I am further" (says " Gen. Brownrigg) " commanded to ob- " serve, as you remark upon the expence of " these premises being disproportioned to " the public utility which may be derived " from them, that the agreement entered " into by the late Barrack-master General " was sanctioned on account of its being ne- " cessary to hire these premises, and in " doing so to remunerate Sir H. M., whose " residence had been destroyed by the field " works which had been constructed in the " immediate vicinity of the house." This " letter is dated 23d Jan. 1805, above 5 " months after the jury had awarded to Sir " H. M. 400 l. a year, and 1100 l. the first " year, as a remuneration for the damage " done to his residence by the field works " constructed in its vicinity; or, as the ver- " dict states, " to provide himself with ano- " ther place of residence."——The lease, " therefore, must be completed without de- " lay. But for this purpose the authority " of the Treasury was also required—so " many checks does our constitution provide " to controul the expenditure of the public " money! Gen. Hewett accordingly laid " the above letter from the Commander in " Chief before the Treasury, inclosing an " estimate of the expence, viz. rent to Sir " H. M. 400 l.; yearly repairs, 50 l.; taxes,

" 143 l.; barrack office to take care of the " house, 50l. making in the whole 643 l. " future annual expence, besides 250l. " which Gen. Hewett informed their ord- " ships had already been expended in the " first repairs. Mr. Sturges Bourne imme- " diately answered the letter, by authorising " the general to complete the lease, and to " lay out the sum of 643 l. on immediate " repairs, according to the estimate. To " be sure this was needless, for the sum re- " quired was only 250 l. according to the " estimate, and that sum had already been " expended; but Mr. S. Bourne had never " taken the trouble to understand Gen. " Hewett's letter, or to read the estimate; " far less did he throw the smallest obstacle " in the way of Sir H. M's. bargain, al- " though he saw from Gen. Brownrigg's " letter, inclosed in Gen. Hewett's, that this " bargain was intended as a compensation " for the vicinity of the works, and knew " that the hon. baronet had already received " a compensation for it—so efficient are the " many checks provided for the controul of " public expenditure!——The lease was " accordingly completed at last; and the " opinion of Gen. Hewett has been amply " corroborated respecting its inutility to the " public, or to any body but Sir H. Mild- " may. The only advantages derived by " the service, in return for a yearly expence " of 643 l. beside the first repairs, is, that " Gen. Campbell and his aid-de-camp re- " sided there near 7 months in 1805; that " Gen. Murray and his aid-de-camp resided " there above 3 months in 1806; and that " the sum of 4 l. was received, as two " months' rent for the pasture ground near " the house; the gardener having the use " of the garden ground for keeping the " whole in order.——It is perfectly mani- " fest, then, that the public has been pay- " ing, and still continues to pay, 643 l. a " year for almost nothing; and that of this " sum, Sir Henry Paullet St. John Mild- " may has been receiving, and continues to " receive, 400 l. a year, for something " which he had sold to the public by ano- " ther bargain. The jury gave him 400 l. a " year because the military works were too " near his house, after making full com- " pensation to his tenants. The Treasury " paid for a bill to free him for ever from " the incumbrance of a forced residence " there. All this is not enough, the Bar- " rack Office gives him another 400 l. per " ann. because, again, the military works " were too near his house.——Strictly " speaking, his first compensation should " have been estimated with a reference to " the 3 monthss residence; but we do not " mean to quarrel about this point, admit- " ting that he should have received as much " as if he had always lived there, or always " been allowed, by circumstances, to let his " house; we maintain, that after receiving " an ample remuneration, both in money " and in the act of parliament, on account " of the works in the neighbourhood, he re- " ceived, on the very same account, as high " a rent for his premises as he could have let " them for, had no such works been erect- " ed —(See Surveyor's Report, 24th May, " 1804). We maintain that this is selling " the same thing twice over, and that the " parties to this transaction, viz. the present " ministers, authorised, and their favourite, " Sir H. Mildmay, obtained, what by the " very mildest construction, must be reckon- " ed a job.— This statement is faithfully " abridged or copied from the 4th Report, " p. 164 to 167, and the documents. In- " deed the whole Report well deserves the " attention of the public; for *it discloses* " *such profusion in those who direct, and* " *such negligence in those who ought to* " *check the public expenditure, as hardly can* " *be paralleled under any other government.*" Bravo! Encore! Out with it, Mr. Perry! But, then, with what justice is it, that you stigmatize, as Jacobins and Levellers, all those who wish to cut off the source of these jobs?——Praised, again say I; praised without ceasing be our gracious king for dissolving the parliament! Had not the king been graciously pleased to " recur to the sense of his people," not a word should we ever have heard of this most curious transaction. Oh, what good will, in the end, arise from that dissolution!——As to the particular exposure now before us, I must first observe, that I have not yet seen the Fourth Report; that, therefore, I cannot tell whether the statement, above quoted from the Morning Chronicle, be true, or false; that I do not publish it as containing admitted truths; and, that all the remarks I am about to make upon the transaction will be inapplicable, in every respect, if the statement should prove to be false.——The statement speaks for itself. If true, it does not appear capable of being done away by any sort of explanation. It must either be flatly contradicted, or it must be acknowledged to contain the history of a job not surpassed by that which Swift imputed to Lord Peterborough's steward, who pulled down a house, sold the materials, and charged his Lordship with repairs. Here is, in this instance, a refinement in jobbing, which, I think, is without an equal. The thing, in all its parts, seems to

have been so well contrived and so well executed; and the train seems to have been laid at such a distance, that one is struck with admiration of the skill and patience of the several parties concerned. Nor would all this skill and patience have been of any avail, had it not happened, as it did most fortunately, that his royal highness, our consummate and virtuous Commander in Chief, *pitched upon the precise spot in question*, whereon to establish a military post; the precise spot where Sir Henry Mildmay had an estate encumbered with an obligation of residence, from which obligation the establishment of the post, with the help of an act of parliament, would, and did in the end, for ever release him, and, what was of peculiar advantage, *secure him a compensation for the annoyance which the post would give to his residence, after he had been for ever released from such residence!* To persons not acquainted with the military science, as practised in this country, or, at least, but superficially skilled therein, the choice of this spot for a military post would appear still more surprizing; but, our penetrating Commander-in-Chief, who, with such admirable skill, saved his army, or great part of it, and even himself, at Dunkirk and the Helder, saw, in a moment, that this spot was of vast importance in a plan of national defence, and that the spot belonged to Sir Henry Mildmay was, of course, a circumstance that weighed nothing at all with the royal Commander, who was anxious about nothing but defending the country against those rascals, the French, who, if they once got to London, might, as he doubtless perceived, seize hold of the reigns of government, and lay the people under heavy contributions, in order to satisfy the wants, or demands, of their rapacious and profligate leaders. His royal highness, doubtless, thought of this; and knowing as well as most men what fellows the French are for *pushing on*, he appears to have resolved upon stopping them at *Moulsham*, whither he supposed, I dare say, they would not, if once landed, fail to direct their march. But, though the spot was, we must conclude, the most fit that could be found for a military post; yet, the selection of it must, as was before observed, be regarded as a *fortunate* circumstance for Sir Henry Mildmay.——Proceeding, agreeably to what is above premised, upon the supposition, and upon the mere supposition, that the Fourth Report is correct as to facts, and that the Morning Chronicle has, in this instance, given a faithful abridgment of the Report, I would beg leave to remind the reader, that there is a law against *contractors* sitting in the House of Commons, though *loan* contractors and *Bank*-contractors do sit there. *Naval* and *Military* contractors are meant, I suppose. But, in the case before us, is not Sir Henry Mildmay a *contractor?* What is he else? Good God, how has this system of posts and barracks and numerous armies and endless funding changed the constitution! And, how is it possible for that constitution to be restored to its purity, while the servants of the king have from 60 to 70 millions a year passing through their hands, and while they are, of course, the patrons, the employers, or the customers of one half of the population of the kingdom? In the instance before us we have a proof of the fallacy of the doctrine, that all the sums not included in the *civil list* are expended upon real services. We here see, that there are other ways of bestowing the public money besides those of the place and pension list. We here see, that the public money may be received by those who wear the garb, and even speak the language of independence. At a dinner, given by Sir Henry Mildmay and Mr. Chute, at Portsmouth, on the 29th of last month; a dinner given evidently for the purpose of flattering the *Dock-men*, who, at the former election voted against them, and who would vote against them to morrow, if a change of ministry accompanied with another dissolution, were to take place; at this dinner, where a doggerel song was sung of which the following was a stanza,—

" Sir Henry and Chute, then have join'd your good cause,
" They will ever support your Religion and laws;
" *No Popish invaders* your peace can disturb,
" While such Britons step forward for King George the Third;"

at this dinner, in the procession to which Lady Mildmay, her daughter, and Mrs. Chute, modestly took a part, unenvied by any human being; at this dinner, the scenes of which united the excess of vanity and of meanness; at this dinner, Sir Henry Mildmay made a speech, which, as reported in the HAMPSHIRE TELEGRAPH news paper of the 1st instant, contained the following passage, which the reader will find most applicable to the subject before us. " Mr. Herbert had coupled his " and his colleague's name with the word " *peculation*—Why he had done so, he " could not conceive. Mr. Chute had re- " presented the county for 16 years, and " had never asked for *a place or pension or* " *favour from government for himself, his* " *family, or any of his friends.* He (Sir

" H. Mildmay) had represented the city of " Winchester for 12 years, and he would " *solemnly declare the same on his own part,* " *as he had for Mr. Chute.* His family " had formerly had the honour of repre- " senting the county, and had *never received* " *a single guinea out of the public purse.* " *(Great applauses.)* He was not disposed, " now the election was over, to carry on the " war; but if the hon. gent. had looked to " his own family, he might not be so ready " with the word peculation. The late ad- " ministration had claimed great praise for " instituting the Committee of Enquiry " into the finance: he thought they de- " served praise for that, and he was not " disposed to withhold it where due; he, " however, would say the present ministers " would revive that committee, *not indeed* " *constituted as before,* when 16 persons " notoriously connected with government " made part of it, (he and Mr. S. Bourne " being the only persons in opposition " belonging to it) but *composed of county* " *members, of independent persons;* and " should his colleague and himself be of " the number (which was probable) he " pledged himself for both, they would " examine into the waste of the public " money, *from those who put £30,000* " *per annum into their pocket for doing* " *nothing, down to the lowest and vilest* " *peculator.* One word more he would " add. He revered the glorious memory " of Mr. Pitt; *those who trod in his foot-* " *steps should have his support,* whoever " they might be. Amidst all the glorious " things that great man did, he never gave " the public cause to lament one act, but " that of sacrificing to his country's cause " his most valuable life. (Loud and re- " peated applause.")——The conclusion of this speech clearly proves, that Sir H. Mildmay looked with the utmost contempt upon those to whom he was speaking, or that he regarded them all as peculators either in will or in deed, or that he was, upon this particular occasion at least, blessed with assurance such as few men can boast of; for when one considers the conduct of Pitt, when one views the effects of that conduct, when one reflects upon the millions and hundreds of millions that he squandered away, when one compares the situation of the country at the out set and at the end of his predominance, to what, but to one of the aforementioned causes, can be attributed this eulogium? That very 30,000 pounds a year, given to a man for doing nothing, of which Sir H. Mildmay here complains, was given to that man by Pitt. All the peculations, to which Sir H. Mildmay here alludes, took place under the administration of Pitt. It was proved to the House of Commons, of which Sir H. Mildmay was a member, that Pitt lent 40,000 pounds of the public money to two members of parliament, without interest, without any authority for so doing, and without letting even his colleagues in office know any thing of the matter, of which no record, or minute, was made; it was proved, besides, that this money was so lent to enable those members of parliament, who were also loan contractors, to make good an instalment upon a loan, for which instalment they received a bonus from the public; and that, thus, *the public were made to pay interest and a bonus for the loan and the advance of its own money.* This Sir H. Mildmay well knew; and yet had he the face to say, that *whoever trod in the footsteps of Pitt should have his support,* those footsteps which had been invariably marked by some fresh attack either upon the property, or the personal liberty, of the people! But, if the history of the *Moulsham* contract, as given by the Morning Chronicle, be true, our astonishment at this eulogium upon Pitt naturally ceases; and we can now account for what seemed, before, so unaccountable, and what I have dwelt upon so many times; namely, the subservience of Sir H. Mildmay to Mr. Canning, Old George Rose, Mr. Sturges Bourne, and the rest of that set, by whom Pitt was continually surrounded.——We have, in this speech, a hint thrown out as to the manner in which the *Finance Committee* is to be *new-moddeled.* " It is *not to be com-* " *posed as it was before,*" Sir H. Mildmay tells us. It is to be composed " of *county members,* of *independent persons.*" Yes, Sir, persons as independent as yourself, no doubt; but, Sir, unless it be composed *exactly* as it was before, as far as that is *possible,* be you assured, that the public will be at no loss to discover the motive for the alteration. A rigid inquiry is expected, and who is so able to prosecute such an inquiry as those persons who have lately been in office, and have, of course, obtained a knowledge of the arts by which accounts have been disfigured and the public cheated? These are the very men that ought to be upon such a committee: and, I defy you, or any one else, to point out a single injury or inconvenience that could arise *to the public* from the committee being so composed. The committee are not *judges,* or *jurors*; they are merely *inquirers,* examiners of evidence, and framers of charges. It will rest for the House of Commons to judge; and, I can see no reason for any

one, except a peculator, to wish that those examiners should not be active and rigid. I hope, that you have spoken without authority in this instance; I hope the ministers will not attempt to stifle the inquiry by new-moddeling the committee; I hope they see the necessity of bringing peculators to justice, of squeezing the robbers and restoring the stolen goods to the public; I hope, that they will seek in this way to secure their power, and not in the way of new bribes taken from the labour of the people; but, if I am disappointed in this, I shall not be disappointed in anticipating their speedy overthrow and their everlasting infamy. The nation's eyes are open. It is waiting with no common degree of anxiety for the drawing up of the curtain. Scene the first of act the first is the re-appointment of the Finance Committee; and upon the manner in which that is performed it will depend whether the piece shall be saved, or damned. The opposition are coming back with formidable, though decreased numbers; and, in spite of the jeering at "all the talents," they are, in point of talent, beyond all comparison superior to their rivals. They did, indeed, shamefully and most foolishly neglect their duty when in office, by favouring and screening the peculators who had fattened under Pitt; but, they are none of them peculators themselves, and, which is full as important, there are few of the sturdiest amongst them who have any friends amongst the peculators. They are, indeed, stripped of their offices, and of the influence which those offices give; but, they *have been in those offices*, they have been behind the curtain, they understand the machinery, the pegs and wires are familiar to them; and, though the people are justly angry with them for not making the exposure while they were in office, that anger, as is very natural, will wear away if the exposure be now made, and particularly if the making of it be opposed by the ministry. So that the only way in which the present ministers can retain their power, without openly declaring against the people and relying upon mere force, is, to prevent an exposure being made by the opposition by making that exposure themselves. No apologies, no shuffling, no tricks of new commissioners and new boards, will now do. A full and honest exposure must take place, with the free consent, and even with the aid, of the ministers themselves, or the day of their political perdition is at no great distance.——In returning to the part of Sir Henry Mildmay's speech, more immediately connected with the *Moulsham* contract we observe him very studiously declaring, that neither he nor his colleague has ever received either *place or pension* from any minister, and that they have not asked for place or pension for any of their relations. So far so good, because this is a confession clearly implied, that not to obtain places or pensions, for themselves or their relations, is meritorious in members of parliament, and that to obtain them is the contrary. I will not stop here to ask Sir Henry Mildmay what answer he would have made, if, amongst all the Portsdown freeholders, there had been one to ask him how he came to give his support and to load with his praises members of parliament who have obtained and enjoyed places and pensions in abundance; but I will come to the fact, as relating to the conduct of himself and his colleague, and I would beg to know *what difference* there is in receiving what he receives, if the above history be true, and in receiving the amount annually of a place or a pension? In both cases the money comes out of the public purse, of which he is one of the "*guardians.*" In both cases the money comes for no adequate service rendered. In both cases he himself, as a member of parliament, votes a sum of the public money into his own pocket. Where, then, is the difference? Why, it is simply this, that the man who takes a place or a pension acts a part less sneaking than he who accepts of the public money in the way attributed to Sir H. Mildmay by the Morning Chronicle. ——As to Mr. Chute, he, too, has obtained neither place nor pension; but, did not Sir H. Mildmay go a little too far in asserting, that Mr. Chute had never asked a *favour* of any for a *relation?* Has not Mr. Chute a brother named Thomas Chute? This brother has been, to use the House slang, "a *gallant officer*" in the army; and he is now a "*reverend clergyman.*" As he has, of course, solemnly declared, at his ordination, that he believed himself *called to the ministry by the Holy Ghost*, it will not be expected from me, that I should put any questions about *the cause* of his laying by the sword and taking up the word; but, I may, and I do, put this question to Mr. Chute: did you, Sir, never ask of a minister, or of a minister's understrapper, any *favour* for this brother? With which question I shall content myself *for the present*, and until I have leisure to write a letter to the freeholders of Hampshire upon these matters.——And now, Sir Henry Mildmay, if the history given by the Morning Chronicle be true: I hope it is not true; but, if it be true, what could have tempted *you* to accept of the

public money upon such terms, while you, in common with the rest of the parliament, were calling upon the people to make sacrifices for the defence of their country? Possessed, as you are, of large estates; having so deep an interest in the defence of the country, did it never occur to you to offer to *give* to that country, for purposes of defence, the use of a house that you valued not, and of a bit of ground which, to you, was hardly worthy of a moment's care? you will say, that you were not called upon to give, any more than others were. Well; but, when your country stood in need of your house and land (for we must suppose that to have been the case), was it for *you* to make such a bargain with her? Where could be the *temptation?* Want may, though the law hears it not, make an excuse in some cases; but, want of no sort, have you to plead. The sum, though enormous as compared with the consideration received by the country, is nothing when compared with what you have expended, and continue to expend in wine and haunches for gormandizing electors of different hues, and upon fidlers and cards for their decked-out daughters and their vain and stupid wives. And for what is all this expenditure? For the inglorious triumph which you have just been so ingloriously celebrating? For the honour of being huzzaed by wretches, who, but four or five months ago, treated you with scorn, when you were, in profession at least, making a stand for the independance of the county? for the honour of obtaining the votes of men, whom, in the House of Commons, you had represented as being at the nod of the minister of the day? Are these objects worthy of being bought? Are these objects whereon to waste a fortune? When you read this, if you are alone and take time to reflect, you will answer, "No." I know well what your feelings must have been, after, and even during, the late triumphal dinners at Portsmouth and Gosport; and you will readily believe, that I do not envy you those feelings. All you atchieve, at the very best, is but the privilege of being a minister's partizan. Not a tongue will pronounce your name as connected with any important measure or event. I impute to you no designs hostile to your country; but, it is for you to ask yourself, whether any man will ever ascribe to you any designs or wishes for her good? And, Sir, is it the huzzas of the servile and selfish swarm in the neighbourhood of the Dock Yards; is it the dearly purchased toasts of the more servile and more selfish crew of Winchester; are these objects for which to disquiet yourself, and to lay yourself open to temptation? Johnson was, unhappily, himself a pensioner, or, in his "VANITY OF HUMAN WISHES," he surely would have drawn the picture of one of those hundreds whose pursuit resembled yours. But, in accepting of the support of "*no popery*," there is something worse than vanity. What must you have thought of your audience; what of yourself, at the end of one of those scenes, when you had been, by implication at least, representing the late ministers as having attempted to *force the king to violate his oath?* You well knew that this was not true; and, again I ask you, what were your reflections at the close of the scene? Were not the huzzas dearly purchased with those reflections? And, then, turning to the wasteful expence, did you not start at the imaginary sound of the axe at the stem of your oaks? When a great public purpose is to be answered; when the choice lies between country and self, then, indeed, ease, fortune, and even life, are to be set at nought; but, that the lease of these should be hazarded for triumphs such as you have obtained is contrary to every principle whereby men of sense regulate the conduct of their lives.——These remarks, Sir, have proceeded from no ill-will towards you. I hope the account, which has called them forth, will prove to be unfounded; and, I shall, at any rate, be ready to insert whatever you or any of your friends may think proper to publish by way of contradiction.

CONTINENTAL WAR.——It appears to be likely, that a peace will soon take place between Napoleon and the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia. They will, in my opinion, make peace upon hard terms; and the peace, I think he will propose, will be this: that Poland shall be independent under a Buonaparté; that the King of Prussia, with some parings off towards Bavaria and Holland, shall be re-placed upon his throne; that Russia and Prussia shall, to a certain extent, shut their ports against England; and that they shall join in a war against our maritime rights. That they will agree to such terms I do not say; but, this I do say, that wise English ministers would be prepared for the worst. Of what sort their preparations ought to be I will speak in my next; but, in the mean while I cannot help saying, that the *expedition*, now getting in readiness, appears to me to be by far the maddest measure that I have yet heard of, except as far as the *Hanoverian troops* are concerned.

CATHOLIC BILL.——A correspondent, whose letter will be found in the next page, begins his observations upon the effects of

this bill by congratulating me upon having thrown aside the discussion relative to the *Learned Languages*. He will find that I have not. In this number I have inserted all the letters which remain upon that subject, except one or two which contained nothing but mere repetitions of what had been advanced in former letters. I shall now, when I have read all over, give my reasons in support of my propositions; and when I have so done, my correspondent will find, that the subject, which I did enter upon *by accident*, is much more of a *political* than of a literary nature.——His objection to the Catholic Bill, upon the score of *discipline* in the *army* and *navy*, might be very solid without at all affecting my position, that it would not have been dangerous to *the church*; though I cannot help thinking, that he has recourse to a very fertile imagination in supposing, that Popish Priests would get on board our ships in the character of common sailors, especially when he considers, that, for not reefing handily, they would be liable to receive a couple of dozen at the gangway, without any other ceremony than that of a verbal order of the captain to tie them up and give them the lashes! Popish priests, as well as Protestant priests, he may be assured, love their carcasses better than this. Their Kalendar is full of Saints; and, if it were not, they would, I am convinced, feel little inclination to seek canonization through the means of maritime martyrdom.——The close of his letter is, I am sorry to say it, an open apology for deception, and for a total disregard of that constitution, by which it is professed to govern us, and, what is more, *for the preservation of which we are called upon to spend our last shilling and to shed the last drop of our blood.* It is, however, manly to *speak out*, as this correspondent has done; but, the fac is, that to attempt disguise any longer *is useless*.

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

The Eighth Volume of the PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, comprising the period from the commencement of the last session, December 15, 1806, to March 4, 1807, will be published on Saturday next.

The Second Volume of the PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY OF ENGLAND (comprising the period from the Accession of Charles I. in 1625, to the Battle of Edge-hill in October, 1642), will be ready for delivery on Saturday the 4th of July.

CATHOLIC BILL.

SIR;——You doubtless remember that you have occasionally assumed to yourself considerable merit from the publication of all important papers, domestic and foreign; and it is lamented by all your friends that these historical records have lately disappeared from your pages to make room for a discussion on the Learned Languages, not at all connected with the purposes of a Political Register.—But as you seem to have become sensible of this impropriety, I could wish you to recur to your former custom as soon as possible, and to begin afresh by printing Lord Howick's bill, about which so much discussion has naturally appeared in your Register, as being a question agitated among the public at large.—As you are indisputably a person of much experience and sagacity in political considerations, I confess that I have been led to conclude that you yourself have not given much attention to the latter part of this famous bill, that being in fact the part most objectionable, and which in all probability was fatal to its progress through parliament.—In your letter to Mr. Perceval (p. 993) you state, That the bill proposed 1. "To render it *lawful* for "the King to grant, *if he pleased*, commissions to English and Irish catholics, "through the whole of the several ranks "of the army and navy; and 2. to insure, by "law, the free exercise of his worship, to "every roman catholic soldier and sailor." —The first part of the bill, I think with you, was not objectionable. Indeed in so far as it went to extend the Irish law, of 793, to the whole United Kingdom, it was not objected to by the King, nor by any other person whatever; and the extension of that law to the higher and confidential situations in the army and navy, was not very important, as is indeed abundantly manifest from the contempt in which the Irish catholics appear to have held the intended boon. Perhaps they thought it rather aimed at the promotion of some of the catholic connections of the Grenville family, than their benefit; for in the common course of promotion unaided by powerful influence, it was, if at all a benefit, only so to a few of the junior part of the present generation.—The second part of the bill you seem to consider as equally unimportant in its proposed effect; seeing "that (p. 993) "the roman catholic soldiers and sailors are "and long have been freed from all restraint "as to their exercise of their worship."— I confess myself somewhat surprised, that it seems necessary to point out to you the wide difference between *permitting* in the army and navy the exercise of the roman catholic religion, by *sufferance* and *granting* it by an *express law*. In the first case, the

exercise of it must needs be unobstrusive, aud when not purely religious, at least not mischievous; in the second case, the open exercise of that religion would become a symbol of distinction, tending to facilitate mutiny. As the effect of this part of the proposed law threatened the navy more nearly than the army, let us suppose a certain proportion (a third for instance) of a ship's crew, to be roman catholics. At present you say, "They are, and long have been "freed from all restraint as to the exercise "of their worship."—This freedom from restraint however extends no farther than to the *private* exercise of their worship, nor could it be further extended without introducing in some shape a catholic priest, whose flock would of course be much more obedient to him than to their heretick officers. Under the operation of the intended law, a priest would most probably at first be introduced in the character of a common sailor, and as his condescension in this would make him themore popular and more dangerous among the crew, it wouldsoon be found necessary to recognize the office, and, to carry two chaplains,one protestant the other catholic, sharing the emoluments of the situation according to the respective number of their flocks. In the natural ambition to increase his own importance on board, the Roman Catholic chaplain would of course raise many discussions with the commanding officer, upon the obvious question of what are and what are not "proper and seasonable times" for attending divine worship, consistent with the Roman Catholic persuasion or opinions. The difference of opinion between the captain and Roman Catholic chaplain would form all the Roman Catholics in the ship into a consistent party; if, indeed, the usual popular assiduity of the Roman Catholic priesthood had not already done so; and it is not difficult to foresee that the numerous class of common sailors, who are but too indifferent toall religion, would naturally range themselves in the same party, as authorizing them in a legal opposition to their officers.——I shall not further pursue this subject. It is manifest, that either the commanding officer must by undue compliances flatter the Roman Catholic chaplain into cooperation with himself, or venture the dangerous disaffection of the crew by opposing him: in other words, that there would be two commanding officers in each ship; one armed with the admiralty commission, the other with the popular favour of the crew. How long could subordination be maintained under such circumstances? Or rather, how many of our ships would be steered into the enemy's harbours in a twelvemonth?—In the army the mischief is not so imminent, though the heavy threat against any officer acting in violation of this law, would very much diminish the prompt authority so essential in the army; wherein, under this law, officers might be threatened, and actually brougnt before a court-martial, by their soldiers, on every pretence of having prevented their attendance at a divine worship consistent with their religious opinions.—I cannot conclude my letter without noticing to you some *unfair* arguments and statements which have been used by the favorers of lord Howick's bill. 1. I considerit unfair to argue from any analogy between the Irish Catholics and any other Catholics. The Irish peasantry who contribute to fill the ranks of our army and navy are Catholics; but they are also (not by their own fault, indeed,) less civilized than any other people in Europe. I need not remind you of the Dutch adage quoted by DeWit, "that in po-"litics as at billiards, the ball must be struck, "not from the best place, but from where "it lies." It would indeed be happy for themselves and us, if the Irish peasantry were already civilized, but as they are not, can they be treated with the same confidence as if they were so? Civilization is a work of centuries, and I think we see no probability of its advancement by the government of Ireland, which experience shews is too *unstable* for any good purpose, even if administered by the most capable and patriotic minds. 2. It is also *unfair* to speculate on any voluntary enlistment of Irish Catholics as consequent from this bill. They enlist in greater proportion than the English already, and without making any inquiries about the exercise of their religion, from this plain motive, that a man who lives in a wretched hut, clothed in rags, and on no better food than potatoes and buttermilk, justly deems the pay and accommodations of the soldier or sailor as an improvement of his condition, while the Englishman feels the contrary. On this ground I do not think that lord Howick's bill would have raised a single recruit. 3. I think it *unfair*, or at least incautious, in those who now blame what they call the *yell* of "no popery," not to adduce facts in proof that snch a cry has been prevalent. I do not mean that the present administration or any other would not use any cry by which they might hope to influence elections of members of parliament, on which elections depends their continuance in office. The nature of things requires this: under whatever stigma of theoretical impropriety, they MUST succeed in procuring a majority

in parliament, and so powerful an auxiliary as a popular cry cannot be neglected in this urgency. But where have the present administration succeeded in raising this cry? At Northampton, at Ipswich, and perhaps at Shields: I am ignorant of any other instances of their success, and should be glad of more extensive information; till which I shall suspect that the cry, "*that there is "such a general cry,*" is as unfounded as such a general cry itself could be. Indeed, you have complimented the people of England for not having been misled by a few addresses, which, with becoming prudence, waited till a change of administration was accomplished. ——I depend on your singular candour for insertion of this letter, which in so many particulars is adverse to your own opinions.——M. P.—*8th June,* 1807.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 25.

SIR, ——As you have invited all who wish to try their skill on the subject, to discuss with you the question of the utility of classical learning, by which expression is commonly understood, however improperly, a knowledge of the languages of Greece and Rome, I take the liberty of sending you a few observations. The question, I think, divides itself into two parts: 1st, whether a knowledge of the dead languages be necessary, in our time, to the formation of a correct taste in composition, and to a relish of all that is great and exquisite in the productions of mind? And, 2dly, whether according to our existing institutions, it is necessary to those who aspire to eminence in any of the three liberal professions? As to the first question, I think, that although a knowledge of the learned languages, is not without its use, it is by no means NECESSARY; and, therefore, I conclude that it is not worthy the sacrifice of twelve or fourteen years in its acquisition. At the period of the revival of literature, this knowledge was NECESSARY for the purpose of forming a taste, and finishing an elegant mind; but we have now obtained models of every species of literary excellence even in our own language, models I will venture to say, equal to the best productions of the best times of Greece and Rome. In sublimity of conception, in variety and richness of fancy and feeling, and in strength and elegance of diction, Milton, in the opinion of the best judges is not inferior to Homer; and, although Homer be the father of poetry, it is not uncommon to find a son superior to his father. In all the higher powers of poetical excellence, Spencer is superior to Virgil; but, perhaps, there is a polish and art in the Roman poet, which the English one has not attained. It must be obvious to every mind formed to feel the highest elevation of a muse of fire, that none of the Greek tragedians is to be compared to Shakespeare; perhaps we have other tragedians equal to any of the Grecian school, not for their elegance and art; but, certainly, for all that constitutes real poetry. Fletcher and his great contemporary will not sink in this comparison. In the inferior orders of poetry, in which I class whatever possesses not the highest power of the imagination, Pope, Collins, Gray, and the author of the Castle of Indolence, will bear a comparison with the best productions of the Roman muse. In eloquence, nothing in Demosthenes is superior to some of the happiest flights of Lord Chatham; and Burke, for depth of philosophical observation, for legislative wisdom, for richness and variety of fancy, figure, and illustration, stands without a rival in all antiquity. Cicero, the English orator took for his model (at least such was the opinion of Fox expressed in a letter to me on the subject, after the death of his illustrious friend); but no one can hesitate on the character of Burke's eloquence being superior to that of the Roman consul. The speeches of Burke are not alone to be brought into this comparison, for his Reflections on the French Revolution, his Regicide Peace, his Letter to the Duke of Bedford, form specimens of eloquence, in all its rich variety of power. Cicero, indeed, wrote on all the topics of philosophy which were agitated in his time and country, with great address and eloquence; but he was but the retailer of other men's thoughts, he threw no new light on the speculative sciences, and both his speeches and writings are greatly deficient in extensive and original ideas. In comparing his speeches with those of Burke, another allowance should be made in favour of the English orator, for the speeches of the Roman which we have, appeared from his own hand, whilst few of Burke's enjoyed that advantage —Our correct prose writers, leave us nothing in this respect to learn from the antients. The prose writings of Milton, of Swift, and Horne Tooke, invite the imitation of every writer. In history, Hume is equal to any of the historians of Greece and Rome, for profound and extensive philosophical observation; and Gibbon and Robertson, may fairly be classed with the least exceptionable of the Roman writers. Indeed, perhaps, the province of historical composition, is not sufficiently distinct from eloquence and general prose writing, to merit

a separate analysis. I do not touch upon philosophical writings, as they tend rather to strengthen than to polish the mind; and, surely, in this respect, we are above antiquity. Except the revivers of the metaphysics of Plato, few will question this fact. I think few who consider with attention what I have written, and come to it with a truly candid mind, will continue to affirm, that, (however useful a knowledge of the dead languages may be), it is absolutely NECESSARY to the formation of a truly elegant and cultivated taste. In approaching the second part of the question, whether such knowledge be NECESSARY, to those who aspire to eminence in the liberal professions, I fear I shall be obliged greatly to differ from what I conceive to be your opinion. The records of our religion are in the learned languages; most of the old medical writers use those languages; and the law is often, in its maxims, and sometimes even old conveyances are, in the Latin language. No instance of an eminent divine or physician can be given, who was ignorant of the learned languages; and, I believe, but few lawyers of eminence have been wholly without them. Wallace, who was Attorney General, and a very profound lawyer, is perhaps the most remarkable instance which can be given of eminence in the legal profession, without classical knowledge. Two or three lawyers at present get money enough, without classical learning; but have no great reputation as being profound in their profession. For the professions of divinity and physic, I think classical literature NECESSARY; and for the profession of the law, some Latin seems almost indispensible. I hope the discussion you have provoked will be continued, until this great question be determined, and permit me to say, it is one of as great importance as ever was entered upon the pages of your most valuable Register.——CANDIDUS.—*Feb.* 25.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 26.

SIR;—I mean, omitting the consideration of all other advantages of the Learned Languages, to confine myself to one which none of your correspondents seem hitherto to have thought of. We have divine authority for preserving the different gradations in society; high and low, rich and poor, are of God's holy appointment. and are therefore not to be levelled. In the University it used to be held that, not comparative merit alone, but a different kind of knowledge was requisite to entitle a person to the respective ranks of honours conferred at the taking of the bachelor's degree; and it is surely no very unsound opinion, that the higher orders of society should possess an extension and expansion of mind, a better way of thinking on all subjects and in all circumstances, than the lower orders. It is generally true, that neither time nor chance will alter the cast of an early disposition to virtue, virtue in its most unlimited sense, whether moral, religious, military, or civil; it is proverbially true, that evil communications corrupt good manners. In opposition, therefore, to your sentiment, that "the time given to the learned languages is lost," I conclude, that it keeps those together who are to fill the several posts of the higher orders of society, and that it keeps them separate from those of the lower orders; that it so tends to preserve the best distinctions of high and low, and that it is therefore a positive and important good.—W. B.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 27.

SIR;—Having in your Register of the 14th inst. reduced your former vague and desultory attack upon classical learning, into two distinct propositions, I will venture to enter the list with you on a topic in which you have hitherto displayed more confidence than knowledge, more valour than discretion, and more zeal than prudence. To your first proposition, viz. that the Greek and Latin languages are improperly called learned languages, I will reply by stating the distinction between learning and wisdom; learning is that which we acquire only by being taught, wisdom is either the gift of God, or the fruit of our own experience; in this sense then, every art, science or mystery, which, being reduced to a system of rules, requires to be taught, is a branch of learning. The languages of Greece and Rome, being difficult to be understood, requiring much time and attention, they who have taken the pains to learn them, or profess to teach them to others, are by long custom and the common consent of mankind called learned, and it would be hard to deprive them of a title which they have so long enjoyed undisturbed, though I will not deny that any man may be called learned in that particular branch of knowledge which he has taken the trouble to acquire. The term learned languages seems therefore exclusively to be applied to those of Greece and Rome, because they require much study to be learnt. To overturn your second proposition seems to me not to require much depth of argument, and I should wonder that a man of your penetration and judg-

ment should have hazarded so weak an affirmation, did I not take it for certain, that your enmity to the dead languages arises from your envy of those who understand them, and an unwillingness to allow any merit to what you yourself do not possess, or highly estimate. I suppose you do not mean to affirm that the writers of Greece and Rome, their poets, orators, historians, metaphysicians and moralists, contain nothing worthy of being known or studied, for if you do you will stand alone in opposition to all the greatest men who have lived since the revival of learning; a situation in which, with all your boldness and talents, I should think you would not choose to place yourself. If then you will allow that much valuable knowledge is to be derived from the study of the Greek and Roman writers to all those professions which you have enumerated, I must inquire whether possessing a knowledge of these writers in their original languages, you prefer that method of understanding their realities, to the muddy medium of translation. If you confess that you have no knowledge of these languages, then I must deny your authority to be competent to decide the dispute. Perhaps you will say, that there is no beauty in languages, that one is just as good as another, and deserves to be considered merely as the vehicle of knowledge. Though by no means a friend to the mere study of language, and despising most heartily those men who spend their time in verbal criticism and learned trifling, yet I am not, I trust, insensible to the beauties of language, nor even to the use of it; for as language is the vehicle of ideas, to understand the ideas of any person thoroughly, we must understand the language in which they are conveyed, or we stand a chance to lose much of his meaning; and even to understand our own language, we must be acquainted with those from which so much of it is borrowed, or else we shall be in danger of repeating words by rote, like children or parrots, and very often lose half the meaning and force of a term for want of knowing whence it is derived. Having thus attempted to prove that the matter contained in the Greek and Roman Classics deserves to be studied by those who wish to store their minds with a knowledge of past events or with the bright ideas of men long celebrated for their talents, and that these can only be thoroughly understood by understanding the languages in which they are conveyed; and having also attempted to prove that the languages themselves contain much beauty and utility, I trust you will be prevailed on to moderate a little that tone of confident affirmation which on many other subjects leads you into error, and lessens the value of your opinion in many cases where it might be of infinite service. With all my admiration of your talents, and with all my desire to believe in your integrity, I am not blind to your faults; and if I should have any share in diminishing them, I shall think I have served the public in extending the sphere of your utility.—W. BURDON.—*Hartford, near Morpeth, Feb.* 17, 1807.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 28.

SIR,——Having replied rather too briefly in my former letter, to the confident and dangerous assertion contained in your second position, permit me to resume the subject of classical learning, and endeavour to shew more fully its supereminent advantages in all the different professions in which you have, with unpardonable audacity, declared it to be "worse than useless." The greatest statesmen of modern times, you will probably not deny, if you are at all acquainted with their lives. have formed their minds by the study of ancient history, and ancient morality; and where shall we look for such bright examples of virtue and talents, as in the far famed republics of Greece and Rome, and yet according to your advice, the wisdom of Pericles, the virtue of Aristides, and the patriotism of Leonidas, are all to be despised, and their examples lost to future ages, because the recital of their actions is contained in a language difficult to be understood; yet, tell me what great character was ever formed without encountering difficulties of various sorts; and where is the wisdom of giving up any branch of knowledge, because it is acquired with difficulty. The mind of man does not proceed from its Maker, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, finished and complete. Its formation is the work of time, study and experience, it must be nourished and fed with the milk of knowledge, before it can be said to have arrived at its full growth; and the statesman who should venture to undertake any share in the government of a nation, without having first stored his mind with the precepts of ancient wisdom, and a knowledge of the great events and characters which in former empires contributed to their advancement or decline, would be considered by all sensible

men as a vain pretender, and an empty, conceited empiric, who set up his own mind as an epitome of all human wisdom, and solely sufficient for all great occasions; it is not merely by their own experience, be it ever so great, that men become skilful or intelligent and superior to others in any branch of knowledge, but by availing themselves of the wisdom and experience of others. This is the stock with which every man must begin the world, or he will make very little progress in any thing great, for no man is alone sufficient to form his own mind, or prepare himself " for deeds of high emprise." The greatest men of antiquity availed themselves of all the knowledge their times afforded, and they have left us a stock which can never be dispensed with, or exhausted: they have left us books which have been considered the repositories of knowledge for many hundred years, and I trust will continue to be, when your writings, having answered their temporary purpose, are forgotten. Where then can the statesman study history, philosophy, and poetry, with so much advantage as in those authors by whom it is allowed by all but conceited ignorance, have never yet been excelled; perhaps, you will smile at the word poetry, as a qualification for a statesman, and you may if you please, but every statesman may learn much wisdom and much truth from Homer, Virgil, and Horace. I might mention many other antient poets, whose writings contain much practical wisdom for the management of states; but these are sufficient for examples. Morality, I suppose, you will hardly deny to be a branch of knowledge highly requisite for a statesman, though it is seldom found to influence their conduct; and, in short, all that Cicero requires to form a great orator, in his book de Oratore, is equally requisite for a statesman, a man employed to consult and decide on the interests of a whole community. I maintain then that the foundation of all his knowledge must be sought for in the writers of Greece and Rome, though I am very far from saying that the knowledge of modern times is to be despised, and yet even these together are not all that is requisite to form a statesman; he must have a great natural capacity, and great strength of mind, who ventures to manage public affairs; but to say that his natural powers, be they ever so great, will not be improved, and his knowledge increased, by a familiar acquaintance with ancient history, poetry, morality, metaphysics, and eloquence, is at once to set aside all past experience, and make every man begin the world afresh. The limits of my time and your paper forbid me to enlarge on the further advantages a statesman may derive from the study of the classics in their original languages; or I might shew that no man can be a finished statesman without so valuable an acquirement, for no man who understands these languages will ever allow that either their spirit or their meaning can be conveyed through a translation, any more than a just idea can be formed of a fine painting from the most eloquent description, which every one will acknowledge must fall far short of the original. To be a legislator without being acquainted with the spirit and principles of law, or the laws of the most celebrated states of antiquity, would be a degree of arrogance hardly conceiveable, were we not furnished with daily examples of such unprincipled presumption. To make laws which are to bind our fellow creatures, and to preserve the peace and comforts of society against lawless violence, is the highest employment of human wisdom, and shall any man dare to undertake this employment without being previously versed in the principles of legislation, and of all that is required of a law, before he shall venture to impose it upon others as a rule of conduct? One should think before a man undertook such an office, he would be desirous to inquire into the effects of law in general, and of particular laws in particular states, how they have operated either to restrain or punish evil actions, and why they have failed of the end proposed; and where can any man acquire all this legislative knowledge in such excellence as in the history of the free states of antiquity, so famous for their political and civil wisdom? Whoever ventures to become a legislator without this previous preparation may sometimes do right, but he will oftener be in danger of doing wrong for want of a due knowledge of legislation. To a physician the knowledge of Greek and Latin is indispensibly requisite, not merely to understand the terms, but the principles of his art; for no modern improvements have much extended the study of medicine. Yet ancient knowledge is by no means to be despised. The laws of Rome being at present practised in many of our courts, renders a knowledge of them indispensible for a lawyer; but it is not on that account only that he must understand Greek and Latin, but because the classical authors will tend to form his mind to the love and the practice of all that is just, and pure, and honourable, and to elevate it above the low tricks and chicanery of his profession; they will teach him, that to be a lawyer is to be the friend of the oppressed, the patron of defenceless innocence, the avenger of crimes, the pu-

nisher of evil, and umpire between man and man. A lawyer who enters into his profession without having his mind purified and refined from the mere paltry consideration of gross interest, may make money by dirty and dishonest means, but he will never bring honour upon his profession, nor avoid being a disgrace to human nature. To a clergyman above all other men, the study of the classics is of the first utility. Though I am not willing to acknowledge the superior excellence of christian morality to that which was taught by the sages of Greece and Rome, yet I will not deny that every minister of Christ ought to be of that opinion, and it is impossible for him to convince himself on the subject without having compared the two together, which can only be done by an acquaintance with each in their original tongue, for both Heathen and Christian morality are incapable of being properly translated; if this be true of the New Testament, it is much more so of the Old; no clergyman therefore, can understand his profession who does not understand Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. The knowledge of the classics however is not to be restricted solely to the learned professions; it is of use to the military and naval officer, and more especially to men of great private fortune; for since classical learning has so long formed a part of general education, it has become interwoven as it were, with our own literature, and even with our common conversation; it is impossible, therefore, to take up any English book, particularly of our best writers, which does not contain some classical reference or allusion, which does not derive some of its merits from its classical style of composition, and of which the author has not studied the beauties of the Greek and Roman writers, and infused into his own work, some of their graces and spirit. Milton it is impossible for any man to read without understanding the classics. Pope, Dryden, and Addison, would be almost equally unintelligible to those who have not tasted of classical learning; and Johnson breathes the spirit of the classics in every page of his writings, though unperceived by those to whom they are not familiar. To the study of the classics we are indebted for the sentiments of refined morality, pure patriotism and generous ambitions which have shone conspicuous in many great characters of modern times. Whence did Hampden, Sidney, Russel, Marvel and Shippen derive that virtuous flame of liberty, that proud spirit of independence, that noble abhorrence of tyranny which animated their whole lives, and caused them to devote their time and talents to the service of their country; whence but from the study of those very classics which you despise, depreciate, and vilify with the name of Monkish Mummery? These men were actuated by no mean or party considerations, no narrow motives of private interest or private resentment; they had formed their notions of rectitude and virtue from the sages and the patriots of antiquity; and it was their generous indignation against vice, derived from their admiration of great and noble actions, which prompted them to espouse their country's cause, with the certain risque of life, liberty, and property; in that cause, three of them lost their lives, and the other two lived in honourable poverty. Should you still persist in reviling the study of the classics, though I shall lament your obstinacy, I must still more lament my own insufficiency to convince you of what I am myself so fully persuaded. I remain, with the greatest deference to your talent, and the greatest desire to believe in your integrity, sincerely, yours,—W. BURDON.—*Hartford, near Morpeth, Feb.* 28, 1807.

" LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 29.

SIR,——Though I am a passionate admirer of the Greek and Roman writers, and though you have expressed yourself as if you despised them, I am yet of opinion that our sentiments are not greatly different. You appear to me to have in view an important fact, which in the present practice of education, and state of learning in England, is matter of lamentable contemplation; and I could wish that you would further explain yourself, in such a manner as to place your meaning beyond the reach of misapprehension.——Be assured, Sir, that those who are the most profoundly acquainted with the Greek and Roman authors, will never be among those who patronise the abuses of ancient learning. I will produce to you a noble example. Our own never-to-be-forgotten countryman, John Milton, was a master in classical literature, and an admirer, if ever there was one, of the ancient authors; yet if I am not greatly mistaken, you will adopt his sentiments in the passage which I am going to transcribe, and will, with me, rejoice to associate with you so great an authority in stigmatising abuses, to which his strictures, at this day, so exactly apply. The passage is somewhat long; but its value, I trust, will make you think a page of the Political Register deservedly bestowed upon it. " Seeing every nation af-
" fords not experience and tradition enough
" for all kind of learning, therefore we are

" chiefly taught the languages of those peo-
" ple who have at any time been most in-
" dustrious after wisdom. So that language
" is but the instrument, conveying to us
" things useful to be known. And though
" a linguist should pride himself to have all
" the tongues that Babel cleft the world in-
" to, yet if he have not studied *the solid*
" *things in them*, as well as the words and
" lexicons, he were nothing so much to be
" esteemed a learned man, as any yeoman
" or tradesman competently wise in his
" mother dialect only. Hence appear the
" many mistakes, which have made learn-
" ing so unpleasant and so unsuccessful.
" First, we do amiss to spend seven or eight
" years merely in scraping together so much
" miserable Latin and Greek, as might be
" learned otherwise, easily and delightfully,
" in one year. And that which casts our
" proficiency therein so much behind, is
" our time lost; partly in too oft idle vacan-
" cies, given both to schools and universi-
" ties; partly in a preposterous exaction,
" forcing the empty wits of children to
" compose themes, verses, and orations,
" which are the acts of ripest judgment, and
" the final work of a head filled, by long
" reading and observation, with elegant
" maxims and copious invention. These
" are not matters to be wrung from poor
" striplings, like blood out of the nose, or
" the plucking of untimely fruit; besides
" the ill habit which they get, of wretched
" barbarising against the Latin and Greek
" idiom with their untutored anglicisms,
" odious to be read, yet not to be avoided
" without a well continued and judicious
" conversing among pure authors digested,
" which they scarce taste. Whereas, if
" after some preparatory grounds of speech,
" by their certain forms got into memory,
" they were led to the praxis thereof in
" some short book, lessoned thoroughly to
" them, they might then forthwith proceed
" to learn *the substance of good things and*
" *arts*, in due order, which would bring the
" whole language quickly into their power.
" —This I take to be the most rational and
" most profitable way of learning languages,
" and whereby we may best hope to give
" account to God of our youth spent here-
" in.—And for the usual method of teach-
" ing arts, I deem it to be an old error of
" universities, (not yet well recovered from
" the scholastic grossness of barbarous ages,)
" that, instead of beginning with arts more
" easy (and those be such as are most ob-
" vious to the sense), they present their
" young unmatriculated novices, at their
" first coming, with the most intellective
" abstractions of logic and metaphysics. So
" that they, having but newly left their
" grammatic flats, where they stuck unrea-
" sonably to learn a few words with la-
" mentable construction, and now on the
" sudden transported under another climate
" to be tossed with their unbalasted wits in
" fathomless and unquiet deeps of contro-
" versy, do for the most part grow into ha-
" tred and contempt of learning, mocked
" and deluded all this while with ragged
" notions and babblements, while they ex-
" pected worthy and delightful knowledge:
" till poverty or youthful years call them
" importunately their several ways, and
" hasten them, with the sway of friends,
" either to an ambitious and mercenary, or
" ignorantly zealous divinity; some allured
" to the trade of law, grounding their pur-
" poses, not on the prudent and heavenly
" contemplation of justice and equity, which
" was never taught them, but on the pro-
" mising and pleasing thoughts of litigious
" terms, fat contentions, and flowing fees;
" others betake them to state affairs, with
" souls so unprincipled in virtue, and true
" generous breeding, that *flattery and*
" *courtshifts, and tyrannous aphorisms, ap-*
" *pear to them the highest points of wisdom,*
" instilling their barren hearts with a con-
" scientious slavery, if (as I rather think) it
" be not feigned; others, lastly, of a more
" delicious and airy spirit, retire themselves,
" (knowing no better) to the enjoyments
" of ease and luxury, living out their days
" in feast and jolity, which indeed is the
" wisest and the safest course of all these,
" unless they were with more integrity un-
" dertaken. And these are the errors, and
" these are the fruits, of mispending our
" prime youth at the schools and universi-
" ties as we do, either in learning mere
" words, or such things chiefly as were bet-
" ter unlearned." Milton's Tractate on Education.—It is passing strange that at this very day, the learning of England is little better than what Milton in another place denominates " the toilsome vanity of ver-
" bal curiosities." The glory of an English scholar is to know the obscure niceties of Greek versification. In this trifling study is the time of our hopeful youth at the schools and universities wasted. Every reflecting man who has attended to the instructions at our schools, and universities, must lament that science forms a very insignificant part of the business. Instead of studying the laws of the universe, the nature of man, the principles of human society, and of government, the students are immersed in the grammatical subtilties of Greek prosody; and if they

happen to walk forth a little better instructed in these than their neighbours, they swell with a self conceit which knows no bound, and look down upon others as altogether illiterate and vulgar compared with them.—But this wretched trifling is not less to be complained of by the lovers of ancient literature, than by any other indignant observer. This is not to study an ancient author; any more than was the employment of the mathematician, who read Virgil merely to have the pleasure of tracing the voyage of Æneas on the map. This is to divert the attention from the thoughts and spirit of the author; it is to range butterflies on sheets of paper according to the colour of their wings, instead of studying the great principles of nature which regulate the order of their existence. The consequence is, that among so many who pride themselves in knowing the language of the ancient authors, nothing is so rare as to find a man who has studied the sentiments which they express, and the unrivalled skill which they display in the management of their thoughts. Of course nothing is so rare as to find a man who has profited, in any considerable degree, by the knowledge of the learned languages. It is not understanding the mere words of Milton's divine poem, if any man reads it without studying the thoughts, and the admirable artifice of the composition, that is calculated to convey any improvement, even if he should spend his whole days in calculating the syllables of each line, and meditating the pauses.—This abuse of ancient learning, Mr. Cobbett, which has prevailed so long, and to such extent in England, greatly requires the hand of chastisement. Yet the study of the ancient languages, were it but wisely conducted, would form an invaluable part of a liberal education. Absurd indeed would it be to say, in the infinite stores of knowledge which our own language now contains, that a man, by the study of English books, may not become a very wise man, and a very good writer. But still there are advantages in the knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages, which are much more than worth all the time requisite for acquiring them. To study more thoroughly the genius of the two most celebrated nations of antiquity, is itself an object of manly and liberal curiosity, and of great utility. The languages which they spoke are much more regular and ingenious in their structure than the modern languages of Europe, and greatly assist the youthful mind in acquiring that most important article of knowledge, an insight into the nature of speech. The ancients have been universally allowed to be exquisite masters in the art of composition. They present their thoughts with a skill and an effect, which has scarcely ever been equalled; their ingenuity is refined, and inexhaustible; and the artifice of their writings cannot be studied without the greatest improvement.——You, Mr. Cobbett, are too acute and intelligent not to know that there is something more in the acquisition of a language than the mere knowledge of sounds, or of such ideas as might be conveyed by a translation. Are you not the wiser; is not your mind improved, by the acquisition of the French language, beyond any ideas which you would have acquired by translation? There is an exercise of intellect in the comparison of another language with your own, in observing the mode in which an idea is expressed in the one, and in the other, which you will allow to be in the highest degree improving, and to give a much clearer apprehension of many important distinctions and relations of thought. If this mighty advantage is gained in any degree by the study of a language so nearly resembling our own in structure and idiom as the French, must it not be gained in a much greater degree by studying languages whose idiom is so different, and their structure so much more perfect?—You and I, Mr. Cobbett, will still farther allow, that to derive the highest improvement from an exquisite author, we ought not to satisfy ourselves with a vague conception of his ideas. We ought to enter deeply into his mode of thinking, and imbibe, as it were, his very spirit. But can this be done in a translation? If every English scholar must derive great improvement from studying profoundly the *Paradise Lost*, could he derive equal advantage from studying it in a translation? Or, to take another example, could any man read the Spectator with equal profit in another language, as in its own? If the art of presenting one's thoughts in the best light be of unspeakable value; if it be second only to the faculty of thinking justly; and must ever form a main object of good education, then the study of the finished pieces of the greatest masters of stile, who have ever appeared, is no idle occupation.—Your Correspondent in No. 4, p. 219, endeavours to involve the question in a metaphysical subtlety. He says no new idea is to be got from the ancient authors. But are those authors useless by whom we are rendered more masters of our ideas; by whom our ingenuity is sharpened; our ardour kindled; our taste improved; our powers of imagination enlarged; and our skill in exhibiting our thoughts improved? Perhaps, in a metaphysical sense, no new idea is to be

got from Milton or Shakespeare. But shall we therefore be argued into a belief that the perusal of these authors is not instructive, and that in the highest degree?—But let us take this twister of sand ropes on his own metaphysical ground; even there we shall find it is not true, that the Greek and Roman languages convey no new ideas. It will surely not be denied that they convey the ideas of the Greek and Roman languages themselves; that is, of the most perfect instruments of communication ever known among men. I trust it will not be rashly asserted that this is a trivial matter. Next, they convey all those important ideas of comparison to which I alluded above, and of the subtle relations of thought which those comparisons discover. They convey ideas of all the various idioms of these languages; and what is highly curious and instructive, ideas of the genius, stile, and manner, of the exquisite authors by whom they are adorned.—The truth, Mr. Cobbett, lies in a very narrow compass. As far as languages are learned for the purpose of business, for immediate communication with those who speak them, it is evident they do not form part of the present argument. But, as far as languages are studied for merely mental improvement, it will be found that every reason, with hardly any exception, which applies to the learning of any language, applies to that of the ancient languages, and with greater force: and that many reasons of the strongest kind apply to the learning of the ancient languages, which are not applicable to any other. I can with confidence leave this comparison to yourself. ——Your, &c.——D——s.

" LEARNED LANGUAGES".

(No. 30.)

Sir;—In the controversy which has lately formed a part of your weekly publication, it is to be wished that your correspondents No. 1 and No. 3 would duly consider the force of the just distinction made by W. F. S. (No. 4) between " Learning," so called, and the wisdom or knowledge, whereby a man is enabled to become really useful to himself and to others. That the study of *some* foreign grammar tends to facilitate the acquirements of writing and speaking the English language with correctness will be allowed. Yet it does not follow, that this foreign grammar should be the Grecian or the Roman. In the present age, the French or the German would be more useful.—Admitting, however, the desirableness of an acquaintance with the two dead languages for amusement or for ornaments even this will not support the present necessity or usefulness of the numerous ancient and expensive endowments in our two universities. When colleges were first founded, they were the only seminaries or schools almost in the several kingdoms of Europe. But the very great number of excellent private schools established in England within the last century, and the universal custom now, with every parent who possesses the means, to send their children to some such school, for 7 or 8 years, must surely weaken, if not destroy, all pretensions to exclusive or any superior usefulness in these ancient foundations, whereat the education of a bishop, in their early institution, was not equal to that now acquired by almost every tradesman's son at a common school.—Visiting a friend in a college at Oxford some years ago, he facetiously observed, " there must be a great " stock of learning in that university, be- " cause so much was brought thither by " lads from their provincial schools, and so " little, comparatively, taken away with " them." As far, even, as the boasted knowledge of the two languages extends, I believe that on the aggregate, the above remark is no more than just; while the injuries to their dispositions and to their morals, contracted by the young men, and the gloomy pride and discontent of those, who are compelled for a subsistence to reside until their middle age, contribute not inconsiderably to diminish the sum of public and general comfort. Is it not well known, that these constant residents, as fellows, waiting for preferment until their 40th year, are mere children when they emerge from their cloisters into the world? And I would ask any man of like or fewer years, who has been educated wholly at a decent rural school, from 7 until his 15th year, where he had the opportunity to acquire mathematical with some classical and other now customary knowledge, and who has afterwards been occupied in some business, useful to himself and to others; whether such a man, I say, would exchange his habits and acquirements of knowledge for those of any fellow in any college in either of our two universities?—To speak of arithmetic as an acquirement or a science, will, I must expect, excite a smile of contempt from these people. But this is no more than a confirmation with me of their extreme ignorance of whatever is truly valuable. It is well known they all despise that knowledge, which the late Dr. Johnson said was the most useful, because it was the most certain of all the sciences; that knowledge, without which Sir Isaac Newton never could have accomplished his sublime discoveries. If it should be said

that these colleges are necessary to the qualification of persons intended for the church, this is answered by shewing, that a sufficient degree of previous "learning," or as much as at a college, is acquirable in a provincial school; sufficient, however to enable the candidate to pass the ordeal of the bishop's or his chaplain's examination. But why is so much stress laid on the necessity of laborious study and of much learning, to render men fit teachers of the Christian religion? It no where appears, that either Jesus or his Apostles were learned beyond their native language, which was the Hebrew or Syriac. And it seems a peculiar sort of inconsistency, that all who are designed to propagate the Gospel of Christ must of necessity prepare themselves by nearly 20 years of study into the manners and opinions of pagans, Greeks and Romans, from authors who wrote and died before Christ was born, and who had no expectation nor idea of such a Redeemer. I shall conclude by quoting a noble Englishman and a "*scholar*," and one who therefore was not "a fox without a "tail." "The usual studies of those who "are called "learned" are but a specious "sort of idleness, and the knowledge ac- "quired thereby is but a creditable ig- "norance. Such studies may form mere "antiquaries and scholars, or prating pedants, "but such are not useful men."—I am, &c. —J. B.—*Alton, Feb.* 14, 1807.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 31.

SIR,——Of the five parts into which I have supposed the knowledge requisite, in order to a good general education may be divided (see No. 13, p. 477), the doctrines of ancient writers upon those enumerated 2dly and 3dly are either wholly exploded, or are capable of correct translation, and may therefore be acquired without any previous knowledge of the Learned Languages. The parts enumerated 1st and 4thly are closely connected with each other. To be able rightly to appreciate our own actions, supposes the knowledge of every secret spring exciting to them, which in effect amounts to a perfect knowledge of ourselves. The knowledge of ourselves is that standard by which we compare our first observations respecting man; it is upon this knowledge we engraft all the conclusions that we draw from such observations, and the correctness or incorrectness thereof, will therefore materially depend upon its perfectness or imperfectness. But events of which man is the active agent, forcing themselves in quick succession upon our attention, and sometimes involving our safety and our happiness, urge us to a search for more extensive information respecting him. The individual standard we have thus created, is found inadequate to the dispatch we meditate, and we proceed to form a more general standard, viz. we arrange in one general idea the dispositions, the habits, the passions, the restraints, both moral and political, together with every fact and circumstance which we find inseparate from man in the state of civil society, and when we have established these two standards for our guide and correction, we are enabled to proceed with safety in informing ourselves of those *peculiar* habits, dispositions, passions, restraints moral and political, and of every fact and circumstance, which distinguish individuals and states around us from each other. We take the like method in grounding our conclusions, as we proceed in estimating the effects likely to arise out of these circumstances, as well in regard of those which are general, as of those which are peculiar. And, therefore, we may call the knowledge of ourselves, and the general idea of man in a state of civil society, the *theoretical knowledge of mankind*, and the knowledge of such variations therefrom, as distinguish individuals and states from each other, the *practical knowledge of mankind*.—The part 5thly enumerated applies to authors and orators. These may be divided into two classes. First, historians, philosophers, lecturers, teachers of moral, political, rhetorical and other *rules and precepts*. Second, poets, political orators, moral, literary, and other censurers and satyrists. The first always address themselves to the understandings of the world in general, and define their meaning with so much care, as to render it capable of being conveyed to a reader through the medium of any language. The second address themselves also to the understandings in part, but principally to the feelings of a limited number of mankind, under the immediate influence of certain peculiar circumstances, and the language which they make choice of, bears so immediate and constant a reference to, and is (if well adapted) so completely interwoven with those same circumstances, that unless the reader is perfectly acquainted with them, as well as with the relative circumstances of the author himself, he can never become the perfect master of such an author's thoughts and conclusions, nor enter at all into the spirit, the beauty, and the propriety of many of his most material observations. It may be assumed with equal truth respecting authors of this latter class, that unless they posses an extensive

knowledge of the passions, dispositions, opinions, and circumstances distinguishing and peculiarly influencing those whom they address, it is about impossible for them to make any lasting impression on their feelings, the agreeable excitation of the former being the only music with which the latter will at all chord or harmonise; and hence it appears that this latter knowledge (which in fact forms the principal part of what I have called the practical knowledge of mankind) is the only salient and living source from whence the fundamental parts of all elegant and impressive language in writings, &c. of this latter description can ever flow; by its means, our heart would transfuse and force its own powerful feelings into the hearts of others, and language is the bed through which the torrent bends its course.—For acquiring this practical knowledge of mankind, the assistance we may receive from a knowledge of the learned languages, may be measured by the degree of assistance, which the knowledge of them can render us in forming a more correct and extensive general idea of man in a state of civil society, one part of the theoretical knowledge of mankind. This will depend,—1st, how far it is necessary for us to know what was peculiar to Greeks, Romans, &c. in order thereto; 2d, how far that knowledge can be acquired without some knowledge of their respective languages.——We can form a general idea of man in a state of civil society, correct and extensive enough for all practical calculations without knowing any thing of the Greeks and Romans, by proceeding as I have before pointed out, and assisted by the facts of modern history. But in the writings of their authors we frequently find delineated, scenes of the most exalted fortitude, patriotism, and virtue on the one hand, and scenes of the most depraved treachery, tyranny, and wickedness on the other hand. From these facts the *theorist* will gain a most extensive view into the human heart, and into the consequences resulting from virtue or depravity, carried to such a pitch, and may thereby correct and carry his speculations to a great degree of moral possibility. But the field for such actions was then more unlimited than it can ever become again, unless all that has since been discovered can be forgotten; and, therefore, in applying such speculations to practice, all these variations must be taken into consideration, and if we annex them to our general idea, as something to be deducted from it, we shall have in the mind an unsettled process, rather than a clear conclusion. However, we can acquire that knowledge without the assistance of their respective languages. For those facts from which alone such knowledge can truly be collected, are recorded by historians and philosophers only, and their relations are capable of correct translation, and have been translated by men of the highest literary reputation. We cannot become possessed of it from the writings of poets, political orators, censors, satyrists and others before placed in the second class, because the information we are seeking must be *known* before we can understand those writings. Of what use then may the learned languages be to us? I conjecture the following. They may enable us to distinguish those niceties, if I may so call them, of the genius and the imaginations of ancient writers, as depend upon stile, and pointed and agreeable language, and by rendering us equal to the examination of those niceties, may fit us for one of the most agreeable perhaps of mental relaxations, one which may invigorate and tone the heart and the mind for more exalted themes and studies. We admire the smallest trifles of ancient magnificence. We must, however, be acquainted with the history of the original structure to which they were attached, before we can derive from them the pleasure of a connoisseur; we must also have learned all knowledge which can be useful to us in the general concerns of life, before the learned languages can afford us any use or profit, or perhaps any real pleasure.——N. S. Y.—*Sheffield, April* 4, 1807

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 32.

SIR;—I congratulate the times we live in that they have at length found in you a plain dealer, whose doric style of composition bids fair to cure many of us of our false taste for that meretricious mode which prefers the light and ornamental manner to the solid and intelligible.—Your journal is that star in the west propitious of a happy revolution on more than one subject, and to which, if it can preserve its ascendant, all well meaning men must bow; but should it decline behind the influence of corruption, I own, (impudent, arrogant, conceited and scurrilous as your *polite and learned correspondents* say you are,) it will be difficult to know where to seek for any steadier opponent to despotism either in the political or literary world.—As to your politics, they are to me frequently a cordial after the horrors which the conduct of our trimming Whigs daily produce in my nerves; horrors that almost reconcile

me to the memory of the apostate Pitt and his northern accomplice:

"Those wicked creatures yet do look well favoured
"When others are more wicked:—not being worst
"Stands in some rank of praise."—Shakspeare.

—But what now calls forth my pen, is the desire I entertain, in return for the amusement you have afforded me, to cheer you on in your tally-ho to the learned hounds and foxes of both universities; some of whom I see already coming out of their kennels, shaggy and grim, deep-mouthed, coarse-grained grammarians, of the genuine blood of the pedants and the pedagogues; yet who all, as yet, as far as I can judge, are upon a cold scent with hot noses; particularly your rugged old doer into English of Mulus (p 304) who so kindly informs you, and me, and all your readers, that there were such men as the *Bacons*, Newton, Locke, &c. who were good Latin scholars, with his *ergo*, that a Greek and Latin scholar must be a good thing. The correct dramatic figure, however, that he insensibly makes of himself, must be allowed to be a valuable portrait, and may, in the hands of a man of wit, be the future source of much harmless sport. I think, for my part, when he apostrophises you, I see his everlasting wig trembling on its horrific block, and but that I conceive it would be ungenerous to rob you of the run he is destined to afford your *course-mettled* hunter, I could find in my heart a wish to begin the hark-forward, at once. But this being, I am sure, an old fox with a famous bushy tail, of the right red-herring smell, and not likely ever to lose his brush, I suppose you would like to keep him for your March meeting, when you take the field in style.—Of your other correspondents on the subject of the challenge I forbear to speak, as some of them are not high game others have I think misunderstood you, as to the period at which you place the non-necessity of Latin and Greek. But what I mean to say is simply this, that you have in me that rare monster, so long sought by your dead-languaged correspondent. M. S., (p. 299) viz. *a genuine Fox without a Latin tail*, or even a Grecian hair to cover his naked poll, yet who contrives to think and write almost daily, on some subject or other that he conceives to be of importance to himself or mankind; and, what is still more extraordinary, has never since he was born looked into any grammar, except having, when a child, by rote learned a few French exercises without learning the language; afterwards, when a man, learning the language without the grammar; while as to the Italian, he got to it when full grown like a child, in the country, and yet who is accustomed to take great pleasure in almost daily perusing authors of note both ancient and modern in these tongues; nay, which is still more abominable, who never regrets his ignorant state, except when compelled to read the miserable language of many translators of the classics, whom all their floggings, and all their college studies have not taught to render in accomplished expressions, what they tell us are the works of the most perfect writers, and to imitate whose style alone they recommend a life of study!—From these, of course, I except Sydenham's Plato, Colman's Terence, and a few similar performances, for no one will deny that, as far as the gratification of our taste in stile goes, nothing can be more mortifying than to satisfy our curiosity on the subject of this entertaining part of antiquarian knowledge at the expence of the ear, which we must do, under tortures, if we would examine only in translation how near Varro approached to the experience of some of our common Farmers of this day, or in half the *doers* of the Poets of antiquity seek either for poetry or sense. When, therefore, we see how little effect this knowledge of their styles has produced even on the best taught and ablest heads, I must confess I should think I did my son an injury to condemn him to the drudgery, and vice, and the murder of time, that 8 years passed at either Eton or Westminster to attain them must include; not to speak of that decomposition of morals, and contempt of religion that usually accompanies the experiment.—As to the real knowledge they bestow, when it is by solid argument proved to me, that Shakespeare could not have created his dramatic scenes, without the immediate aid of the Learned Languages, that Milton's prose is the better constructed for his knowledge of them, or that even Goldsmith's Deserted Village owes its charms to their assistance, which he could not as well have derived from a hundred other sources; then I shall begin to think them absolutely necessary to all writers, and that we must be dumb without their influence: But as things are, no man can make me believe that ideas are the more precious from being derived immediately from a foreign idiom, even although the language we take them from be at its utmost perfection, according to the notions of its own grammarians; for ideas being originated from things known compared with things related and possible, I conceive in the present state of signs for ideas, our copious language must be more

than sufficient to enable us to explain all those imaginations are that generated in the mind of any man who has made our expressive words his study, and who has, by perusing our best authors, made himself master of their various modes of expression; and this will constitute an original style, if united with frequent practice in writing down his thoughts; for it is in writing as in painting, no theory can be of any service without almost daily practice; of which truth, you, Mr. Cobbett, must be, I think, as well convinced as any man living: We become, however, mannerists by too long painting of, or too long writing on any one giving subject; and even Goldsmith's happy essays, if considerably multiplied, (as he could for profit have multiplied them,) would at last have partaken rather of the rigid determination of the Ponty pool tea-board, than of that correct precision of the school of a man whose thought and pencil go together. To the Medical man, however I think you cannot deny that a knowledge of the Latin, may be of great assistance in enabling him to multiply comparative cases; as so many coxcombs, not worth wholly translating, yet containing curious cases, have, in their vanity, thought proper to record their observations in that language; thanks, however, to sense and Fordyce, we need not go out of English to study Fever. The Lawyer, also, for the like purpose, should have Latin to enable him to get at reports, commentaries, &c.—As to the Divine, his studies and duties are of so very simple a nature, under the present established and avowedly correct translation of the Scriptures, that doubtless the most common talents are quite sufficient, united with sincerity, to enable him to perform his duties as a Parish-priest; and unless he is bent on a mission to a foreign country, a devotion that seldom troubles our churchmen, no other language can be necessary to enable him to promulgate truth and teach virtue than his own.—The establishment, indeed may require a few ecclesiastical Lawyers; but if it were necessary that all should read the Scriptures in their original tongues, we surely should not see so many ordained who can scarce pass a prepared examination in a language so easily learned as the Greek, or that still easier the Hebrew, in which many an old clothes-man in London is a better scholar, without knowing it, than some of our Bishops; and how little value they themselves attach to it, may be known, by recollecting that nine out of ten of the clergy lay aside for ever all their books, except the Bible and Testament, the instant they are in possession of a snug living. Yes, we see, indeed, where they do cultivate the Greek and Latin, that it is often to *them* apparently "worse than useless;" for, besides the very foolish pride some evince on all occasions, in season or out of season, in quoting detached scraps of sentences, it entices them oftem to read classic authors far more lewd than all the dialogaes of Aretine, such as Anacreon, Tibullus, Aristophanes, or Petronius Arbiter, (whom even Addison was not ashamed to translate, so besotted was he with the language).—Nay, I once knew a very admired divine who would have blushed to have had Rochester's Poems found on the shelf of his library, that, confiding in his family's total ignorance of Latin, always kept a thumbed college Mersius among his other respectables.—Thus you see, Mr. Cobbett, I get on pretty well in my determined ignorance, of which I expect to be told that this letter is a proof, as well as of my presumption, arrogance, impudence, and that string of epithets that the *politely learned* sometimes indulge themselves in using when any wasp attacks their hive; and yet I assure you, when I have done my best, I have sometimes had my share of approbation from critics who never expected to see any thing in print from a Fox without a Latin Tail! particularly one that never read a grammar! Yet I think, ill as I write, I should have written no better on all the subjects on which I have treated, had I possest a complete knowledge of all the original writings of the Greeks or Romans; for let us look at the works of Sir W. Jones, that miracle of literature as to the knowledge of languages, that walking library of erudition; and pray tell me, was his style proportionally elegant? for, except a few lines, that burst from him on visiting a spring in the flower of his youth, I never read any original composition of his that partook of the fire of genius, or that could for a moment stand in comparison with the Daisy of Burns or Miss Brooke's translation, of Carolan's Monody on the Death of Mary Maguire; by the side of which his Sacontala is tame, and his Odes of Hafiz sink to nothing.—The fact, therefore, I believe, is, that where nature has bestowed a good organisation, and quick parts the result of it, with its accompaniment warm feelings, it is better that a man should understand only one language thoroughly than 20 superficially or even thoroughly; for the clearer he understands 3 or 4 languages, so much more time must he have lost in studying them, that he might have better employed in perfecting himself in his own.—Shakespeare, doubtless, was a great reader in order to ac-

quire a stock of ideas, which his natural taste enabled him to appreciate according to their value; also a close observer of manners and the human heart, who well knew that we are all much alike, only differently disguised as to our feelings and failings; and I cannot help thinking that he owed his noble and almost divine style to his good ear and profound knowledge of the whole of our language, selecting from the stores of his memory always such words as uniting sound and sense were best calculated to impress his robust thoughts.—To go further into this subject would demand a volume rather than an essay. I shall therefore leave others to pursue the train, and also forbear to add a hundred other reasons, why mere Greek or Latin scholars must, whether they will or not, be half of them pedants or ignoramuses on many subjects, while the general reader of English authors cannot fail to be saturated with information; for since men can only think in one language, the better they are acquainted with the dead ones, the less readily they compose in the living; and this I believe to be the genuine reason why we have amongst those who by courtesy are called good scholars, so few who compose profitable and original works, who write in a good style, or who join in any conversation with intelligence on the subject of practical improvements in the arts of life, or general œconomy.—I am Sir, A FOX WITHOUT A LATIN TAIL.—*Keynsham, near Bristol, March* 1, 1807.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 33.

SIR;——I have long been impressed with the truth of your assertion, that in general education, the learned languages as they are called, are worse than useless, and that they operate as a bar to real knowledge; and so decided is *my* opinion on the subject, that I cannot but feel astonishment at the number of those persons, who have seriously come forward to oppose it. That a certain kind of good is connected with the study of languages no one will deny, who is aware that to every species of pursuit, *advantages*, and advantages peculiar to itself, are attached. In the present order of things, we are strangers to evil unaccompanied with good, and equally so to good unadulterated with evil, so that when we say of a thing that it is good we only mean that it is comparatively so; or if we affirm that it is evil, we do not mean to convey the idea, that it is in its own nature totally destitute of every thing that is valuable; but that we estimate it as worthless if put in competition with others which are upon the whole more productive of beneficial ends, or that can more easily be applied to useful purposes; and it is in this point of view that I regard the study of the learned languages as a very insignificant pursuit. Men are perpetually reducing themselves and others into erroneous principles by judging of things not according to their intrinsic or comparative value; but in conformity to the opinion that is formed of them by the world, and that seems in its omnipotence to have decreed that whatever is scarce is valuable, however destitute it may be of utility; and to this circumstance it is, that I in a great degree attribute the importance which is by so many attached to a proficiency in the learned languages. We are indeed triumphantly informed by some of these gentlemen, that the study of moral science was no where pursued to such an extent or with so much success, as by the sages of Greece and Rome; and that the discovery and dispersion of ancient manuscripts drew Europe from the sink of barbarism into which it had been plunged for so many ages; but, because these manuscripts contained moral and scientific knowledge, elaborate reasoning and curious distinctions and disquisitions to which the people of these dark and ignorant times were utter strangers, are we, therefore, warranted to conclude, that at this enlightened period they must necessarily be of inestimable importance to us; to *us*, who have elegant and discriminating writers in our own language, upon every subject that can warm the imagination, interest the heart, ameliorate the character or dignify the mind. I am disposed to believe that there is not an idea in any of the works of the ancient authors but what may be met with in the writings of our own countrymen; or I think one solitary instance would have been adduced by the advocates on the other side of the question; but, supposing it were otherwise, and it could be proved that the books of the ancients contained a certained species or degree of knowledge which was not to be found in the living languages, this circumstance would by no means establish the truth of the assertion, that the knowledge of the dead languages must be productive of real advantage to us, unless it could also be proved that it was impossible to convey it to the mind of any but a linguist; and *even* if that were the case, that the time and industry expended in the search after the hidden mystery could not have been more usefully employed; for such are the limited powers and faculties of man, that no one can possess himself in an eminent degree of

every kind of knowledge, and he is the most truly wise who pursues with the greatest order that species of it, that can the most frequently be brought into action, and made the most subservient to the benefit of himself and others. That great and illustrious characters may be formed independently of the knowledge of a variety of languages, the Greeks, as far as we know any thing of them, are striking examples. The Grecian schools were schools of science and philosophy; and certainly science and philosophy instruct in the knowledge of things, and not in the knowledge of words. To the Greeks we are indebted for a great part of the science that now exists in the world, to a people who from what is recorded of them in history, do not appear to have studied any language but their own. To possess themselves of the knowledge of these learned, though unlettered, philosophers, it was requisite to the people of other nations, that individuals amongst them should study as a profession, the Greek language, and so procure for *them*, through the medium of a translation, the knowledge that was contained in the Greek books; but *now* when our booksellers' shops furnish us with the translations of those works of antiquity which are acknowledged by the literati to be the most valuable amongst them; of what avail can the study of the dead languages be to us? But we need not travel into Greece to discover that there is no such intrinsic excellency in what is termed a learned education, as those who possess it, or imagine they possess it, would willingly induce us to believe; for, we have only to direct our attention to many of our own countrymen in the higher classes of society, who have experienced the advantage of such an education, to be convinced that it had nothing to do in the formation of nobility of mind, grandeur of character, or practical wisdom. That strong intellectual powers of mind are, in some instances, combined with a learned education, experience has proved to us: but the persons, in which this union of learning and knowledge is to be met with, rank amongst men of an higher order of intellect than usually falls to the lot of man; nor is it I think at all difficult to account why it is that others of ordinary capacity are generally considerably injured by it. The labour attending the study of a dead language is very great, owing to the obscurity with which it is necessarily veiled; and it is a well known fact, that a greater knowledge of a living language may be acquired by conversing in it in six months, than by reading and translating the same language for two or three years. A great portion of existence, therefore, must be appropriated to the study of the dead languages to obtain any considerable knowledge of them, which might otherwise have been employed in the acquisition of real knowledge. But this is not the most injurious circumstance attending it, for the mind being so much engaged in the study of the signs of things, unless it is of a very superior stamp, is imperceptibly drawn off from the desire of the study of things themselves in those intervals of leisure which might otherwise be devoted to it. The memory, too, is burdened, which has a tendency to repress and shackle its energies. There is something in the constitution of the mind of every child that is in good health, and usually well organized, that disposes it to the search after real knowledge without being aware of it itself. If left free and unrestrained it will be interested by almost every passing scene that it can comprehend; it will inquire into the nature, properties, and cause of almost every object that presents itself to its notice, with an ardor and impatience that strongly mark an anxious solicitude for information. But to the study of language the youthful mind has no propensity, for it feels that the pleasure and advantage that results from the acquisition of real knowledge is not associated with an ability in him to call the same object by a variety of different names. But it may be said, that the same objections may be urged against instructing a child either to spell or read; for, in the first stages of this kind of learning, the memory is, as in the learning of languages, burdened with a number of sounds to which it can affix no meaning, and from which it consequently derives no ideas. This is true; and, therefore, I think those parents are the most wise who are not premature in this kind of instruction; for, I have little doubt but that during the very early period of it, children are generally rather injured than benefited; but the great advantages that are upon the whole to be derived from this temporary sacrifice does so much *more* than compensate for the evil, that no one ought to think, in ordinary cases, of taking it into the account; besides, if it be not commenced too early, this is an art which will, in most cases, be acquired with considerable facility: but what equivalent is there to the feelings of the child, or to the man that will compensate for the fatigue and labour attending the study of a dead language, if we set aside the gratifications of vanity? Were I capable of calling every thing I see in "heaven above or earth beneath" by the various names that are given to them by

all the different nations on the face of the globe, should I by this means, acquire the least acquaintance with any of their properties? would it instruct me to shun fire as an element that would burn me? or teach me to handle carefully the edged tool as an instrument that would wound me? and what would it do for my mind? would such a facility enable me so to avail myself of the passions, habits, and prejudices of mankind, as that I might thereby know how to bring good out of evil? would it fortify my mind under misfortunes? or teach me to be moderate in prosperity, by forming a proper estimate of men and things? or would it enable me to regulate my passions by my understanding? In science, what am I to expect from it? Will it instruct me in moral, mechanical, or philosophical principles? or shall I procure to myself a more correct knowledge of the properties of a triangle or the principles upon which the lever acts than I could have done if ignorant of any other language than my own? Perhaps the most powerful argument that can be adduced in favour of the study of the learned languages is, that they are the repositories of our religion, and that upon a subject so highly interesting, no one should be constrained to take any thing upon trust, but should be enabled, if possible, to form a judgment for himself respecting the genuine meaning of the sacred writers. It is certainly probable, if not certain, that no translation of either the old or new Testament, or of any work in the dead languages, has ever fully conveyed all the ideas contained in the original, for I very much doubt, if the idiom of any language can be perfectly known to any but a native of the place in which it is spoken. Lady Wortley Montague says, in one of her letters, what is most likely true, that a Roman milk-maid must have known more of the language of her country than the greatest scholars of the present day do. If, therefore, the combined efforts and labours of the learned can do so little for us, in this respect, what can any individual expect to attain by his own personal assiduity, however great and indefatigable it may be? Is it not, therefore, folly to dissipate the season of childhood and youth in so unproductive a pursuit, calculated, indeed, very well to furnish employments for Monks in cloisters, excluded from the sympathies, the pleasures, and the duties of the rest of mankind ——R.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 34.

SIR;—— In your Political Register of the 14th of Feb. you assert 1. "that the Latin and Greek languages are improperly called the Learned Languages," and 2. "that the teaching of those languages to persons who are to become statesmen, legislators, lawyers, physicians, or priests, is worse than useless." and, in another number, "to bring this matter to the test, you invite the Learned Gentlemen of both universities to a discussion upon the subject." Now, Sir, although I have neither any pretensions or lay any claim to the appellation of a Learned Gentleman of either university, yet I trust you will not impute it to my presumption, if I commit to paper my thoughts upon a subject, in the discussion of which, in common with the gentlemen of England, I am so deeply concerned.—As to your first assertion, it is a matter, I imagine, of very little consequence, whether the Latin and Greek languages are properly or improperly called the Learned Languages; by pedants and pedagogues the term was probably introduced, and by pedants and pedagogues I leave it to be defended. But the case with regard to your second assertion is very different. The discussion of that assertion is indeed one of the greatest interest to a considerable portion of mankind; and believe me, Sir, you undertook a task of no common difficulty, when you undertook to prove to the satisfaction and conviction of every gentleman that he had employed the first twenty years of his life in learning two languages, the knowledge of which is worse than useless. (I say "the first twenty years of his life," because, during that period, owing to the faulty system of education now pursued, a gentleman is taught very little besides the Learned Languages; a practice, in my opinion, quite as reprehensible as that of altogether neglecting the study of those languages would be.) But surely, Sir, you could not have attentively considered the important subject, upon which you hazarded so bold, and I hope so unfounded an assertion. Did Mr. Cobbett mean to say, that the knowledge of the causes which contributed to the prosperity and decline of the Greek states and Roman Empire is worse than useless to a statesman? Did Mr. C. mean to say, that the principles of the legislator are vitiated by his acquaintance with the laws which established and defended the liberties of the most powerful and wisest nations of antiquity; or that the studying the orations of Cicero, who, of all the orators that the world has yet produced, was the most intimately versed in the laws of his country, is likely to prove worse than useless to the lawyer? Is it not for the good of mankind that the physician's know-

ledge of his art in theory, as well as in practice, should be as extensive as possible? How can that knowledge, which you cannot but confess is most necessary, be acquired, but by the attentive perusal of the most learned treatises composed upon this subject? And the greatest physician of antiquity wrote in the Greek language. How can the priest be more clearly or easily convinced of the superior excellence of his own religion than by comparing it with the ridiculous theology of the ancients, and by studying the works of the first pious converts to the Christian faith? All the best writers on the various subjects with which it is absolutely necessary that the statesman, legislator, lawyer, physician, and priest should be acquainted, have written in the Latin and Greek languages, and, so badly are their works translated, that, to read them in any other language than the original, is indeed worse than useless. Unluckily, Mr. C. you are yourself ignorant of the Latin and Greek languages; but some friend of your's more fortunate in that respect will perhaps explain to you, that Epistle of Horace to Lollius, in which he descants on the utility of studying the Iliad, and on the various beauties and excellencies of that wonderful and immortal poem; and the opinion of the friend of Mecænas and Augustus is not unworthy of the deference of Mr. Cobbett. When you are fully persuaded, as you soon will be, that the study of the Iliad is not worse than useless, request the same friend to explain to you the first 2 or 3 odes of the 3d book, and much as the original excellence of the great Horace must be impaired and injured, by any attempt at rendering his works into the English language; answer me candidly and honestly, and tell me whether you do not think the moral precepts contained in those odes well worthy of the serious attention and consideration of every thinking man. Does Mr. Cobbett imagine that the study of his Register will be worse than useless to a Foreigner, some hundred years hence. I dare affirm he does not. He will say, that although the circumstances of the times may be changed, yet the vices will still be the same and require the same reprehension. So they will, Mr. Cobbett; and I recommend the learning of the English language to foreigners some hundred years hence, for the very same reason that I now defend the teaching of the latin language to the gentlemen of England of the present day; namely, that they may read in the original, those works, which no translation ever can do justice to.—E. L.—*Eton, Feb.* 23, 1807.

" LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 35.

Sir,—A plain well meaning man is now so puzzled by the various opinions on education, that he knows not what system to pursue for the instruction of his family. We have no medium between the common routine of writing and arithmetic, and the study of the dead languages at our national seminaries; no diversity of system which might enable a father to place his son in a course of education, necessary to assist him in his future prospects. At our private schools a boy is harassed with Latin, Greek, French, Italian, writing, and arithmetic, and at sixteen is found to have little or no knowledge of either—the master in many instances incompetent to teach—in some the pupil incapacitated to learn; nevertheless, the fees are paid, and the poor youth has but little benefit. The parent may be blamed, " but " the fault of well meaning ignorance " ought to be pitied not despised." A youth placed at one of our national foundations, is necessitated to wade for years through Latin and Greek: if he has been studious, he acquires a slight knowledge of each language; but for want of persevering in his studies, and from the occupations of an active life, forgets in a short period what was the object of eight or ten years application.—It should be considered that the system of education pursued at our great schools and in our universities, was fixed at a time when the study of the dead languages was necessary for every one in the superior professions; and as education was not expected to be found in any one unconnected with those professions, the system of that period might be right, but it made a monopoly of knowledge in those classes, and kept the other part of society in darkness and ignorance. The study of the learned languages at that period, was indispensably necessary, for Latin was the standard language for all works of consequence on every subject, and an author considered his character degraded, if he communicated his researches in any other language. That system is now exploded, and as we have translations of every work in the Latin or Greek, a reform in the method of education is much wanted.—The lawyers of the present day, I think, are but little indebted to their classical education for any eminence in their profession; few of them after having served the period of their articles could construe a page of Virgil, or a line of Homer; but they continue to deceive the ignorant by their display of Latin, and if a butcher has a consultation on the renewal of his lease; he is told, his business must be considered *ab ini-*

tio, his lease must commence *de novo*, and *quasi* the clause of paying the property tax which his landlord insists on, it is not tenable by the 46 Geo. 3d. *Caput* 65. The poor man goes away astonished at the learning of his legal adviser, and of consequence, that his son may shine in the same exalted sphere, gives him a Latin education. But men of sense are not to be scared with this display of learning, this folly of words, more applicable to the language of a parrot, than a sensible being.—The divines of the present day are necessitated to go through what is termed a classical education; namely, pass through the principal forms of Westminster or Eton, and attend a certain number of terms at Oxford or Cambridge—few of them I believe after two years absence from college, could read without a dictionary a page of Erasmus; and it cannot be denied, but that they are more indebted to interest and favour for an exalted situation, than to any knowledge of Greek or Latin, or of Hebrew. Then why is so much time thrown away in endeavouring to acquire a small knowledge of the dead languages, when, even in the higher professions, it is notorious they are of so little utility, and it certainly goes to shew that the time devoted to them is mispent, and that the whole system of education in our schools is founded in error, and inapplicable to the present state of knowledge.—If some one of sound sense, and acquaintance with the authors of our language, added to a knowledge of the languages spoken at this time in Europe, would mark out a system of education, he would confer a great benefit on the rising generation, and root out from our national foundations, the system of the dark ages of popery and ignorance.—The character of a mere scholar, will always be considered by men of sense and genius, as a nonentity in the world, and however pleasing his intense study may be, it is a selfish gratification, it benefits no one, it shuts him from the world, and precludes the possibility of his giving to any but a select few the least information or pleasure. If he publishes the result of his studies, it is great chance but it tends to support some learned disquisition, the object of which is to prove, that several of the antients have made a false quantity; that several lines in Horace are improperly pointed; or that Troy did not stand where it has been considered to be for several centuries.—This accomplished, the student is dumb for ever. His work, (in the booksellers' phrase) are a mere drug, and consigned to the warehouse as waste-paper.—Without an intense study, or the slightest knowledge of the dead languages, a man may admire the grandeur and fire of the writings of Homer; the spirit and delicacy of Virgil, the inventive power and moral truths of Shakespeare, the sublimity of Milton, and " if he wishes to acquire a style which is " familiar, but not coarse, and elegant but " not ostentations, he must give his days " and nights to the volumes of Addison."—Hence I conclude, that to dedicate a large portion of this short life, to a study that is superseded by the excellence of our inestimable language, is worse than useless.—I am, &c. JUVENILANIA.—*Temple, April* 9.

" LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No 36.

SIR;——I have been much interested, and, in some instances, instructed, by reading the numerous letters you have published, in your valuable Register, on the subject of the learned languages; but, I must confess, that in my opinion, the writers on both sides of the question have often improperly deviated from your plain and simple proposition, " that as a part of general education the study of the learned languages is worse than useless," and have introduced matter quite irrelevant to the subject, and which can have no other tendency than to bewilder the reader. For my part, I think the question lies in a very narrow compass, and in order to form a right judgment respecting it, we have only need of that portion of common sense, of which very few men are destitute. I intend, therefore, to be very brief, and to confine myself, in a great measure, to a few plain facts. I have always been of opinion, that learning is only useful, as it enables a man to discharge the duties of a citizen, with the greatest benefit to society. If this position be granted (and I cannot believe any one will seriously deny it) it may be fairly asked, can a man without a knowledge of the dead languages, perform these duties as usefully as one who is completely master of them? I say *completely*; because, the advocates for the dead languages, will not allow, that, without a critical knowledge of these languages, their beauties can be understood or felt—nay, they go farther, and say, the best translations fall infinitely below the originals. Now, if we read modern history, or examine a chronological list of the most eminent characters that have flourished since the revival of letters, we must perceive that men of the most eminent talents, the inventors of the most useful arts, the asserters of national liberty, have received little or no classical education whatever. It will

be sufficient to mention, Gionia, the inventor of the compass, Columbus, Washington, and our countryman Brindsley, the engineer and mechanic, all of whom, I believe, never enjoyed the beauties of classic lore. On the contrary, we shall find, that the most eminent linguists, who have passed their lives in making and reading commentaries, have seldom possessed any talents, that were serviceiable to society.—They have invented no useful arts, have proposed no improvements in politics or jurisprudence, and have perhaps only been known to the *learned world!* Professor Porson and Dr. Parr have been brought forward by an advocate for the study of the learned languages, and I should be very unwilling to mention their names with disrespect; but they cannot be ranked among the *benefactors of the human race.* There is no people on the face of the earth that would regard them in this light, because they understood the dead languages better than their own! I think every impartial person who acknowledges the above facts, must be convinced, that a man may be *great* and *useful in the highest degree,* without a knowledge of Greek or Latin. But the subject takes a more serious form, when it is considered, that perhaps not one person in a thousand who is forced to spend 8 or 9 years of the prime of life in this laborious study of the dead languages, obtains a sufficient knowledge of them, to enable him to enjoy their beauties, or understand the ancient authors better than he can in a translation of them into his own tongue! and is not the devotion of so much time to a study of the dead languages, with so little chance of ever understanding them, a very serious evil? I allow that modern literature is in some respects indebted to the Greeks and Romans, but the utility of their writings should not be overrated: does not an indiscriminate study of them tend to repress genius, and by trammeling the mind with authorities, deprive it of that free scope and exertion, which are requisite for its improvement. I think that Hume, in one of his essays, considers the subject in this light, and gives it as his opinion, that if the writings of the ancients could be destroyed and forgotten, human ingenuity would be exerted in a greater degree, and consequently carried to much greater perfection. But it may be asked, what will you do with the learned languages? will you discard them altogether? as a part of general education, I do not in the least hesitate to answer in the affirmative. X.

"LEARNED LANGUAGES."

No. 37.

O Verborum inops interdum, quibus abundare semper putas, Græcia!——Cicero. Tusc Quæst. l. 2. c. 85.

SIR;——It is certainly a very strange thing, that in an age like this, where such regard is paid to the advancement of learning, any one should attempt to depreciate it in the eyes of the world; still more wonderful that this learned censor should be, Mr. Cobbett, for whom we have some regard while he confines himself to political discussions, but for whom we naturally feel contempt when he betrays his ignorance upon subjects totally out of his sphere.—It is wonderful how little minds are guided by prejudice, who imagine that their dislike is the dislike of the nation, and their own voice the voice of the people.

"Their passions move in lower spheres,
Where'er *caprice* or *folly* steers."——*Swift.*

—Are the "Learned Languages" of no use to the statesman, to the lawyer, to the physician, or to the divine? Ask any one eminent man in this kingdom, if independent of the amusement, he has reaped any advantage from the study of the Greek and Latin languages; and they will answer you to a man in the words of Quintilian: "Tot nos preceptoribus, tot exemplis instruxit antiquitas, ut possit videri nullâ sorte nascente ætas felicior, quam nostrâ, cui docendæ priores elaboraverunt."——Lib. 12. cap. 11.—I shall not attempt a vindication of the "Learned Languages." Their fame is sufficient, and Mr. Cobbett may vainly flatter himself that his reasonings will 'demolish' every argument that shall be brought against him.—Happy am I to perceive that the Universities have not deigned a reply; and, by their contempt and silence, have shewn Mr. Cobbett how much they value his opinions, how much they regard his censure.—I conclude with the opinion Pope had for the "Learned Languages," who humbly differed from this political Proteus.—

"Hail bards triumphant! born in happier days;
Immortal heirs of universal praise!
Whose honors with increase of ages grow
As streams roll down, enlarging as they flow!
Nations unborn your mighty names shall sound,
And worlds applaud that must not yet be found!
Oh! may some spark of your celestial fire,
The last, the meanest of your sons inspire,
(That on weak wings, from far, pursues your flight,
Glows while he reads, but trembles as he writes,)
To teach vain wits a science little known,
T' admire superior sense, and doubt their own!"

Z. E. C. — *March* 25, 1807.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Brydges Street Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre Pall-Mall